COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. III. No. 22.] *London, Saturday, 4th June,* 1803. [Price 10D

CONTENTS.—*Letter to Lord Hawkesbury.—The Press,* 801. *French Emigrants,* 804. *Switzerland,* 805. *Malta and Egypt,* 806. *Louisiana,* 808. *Parl. Proceedings,* 810.—SUM. POL.—*True Briton,* 820. *Garbled State Paper,* 821. *Arrest of English,* 826. *Mediation of Russia,* 827. *Change of Ministry,* 829.—SUPPLEMENT.—*Lord St. Vincent,* 833. *Veritas on the Navy,* 837. *Declaration of France,* 840. *Message,* 847. *Russian Minister's Note,* 153. *Proclamation for Hanover,* 859. *Order for Embargo,* 860. *Mr. Windham,* 863.

TO THE RT. HON. LD. HAWKESBURY, &c.

MY LORD,—In my last letter (see p. 782), I endeavoured to exhibit a view of the consequences resulting from the treaty of Amiens, together with the conduct and motives of your lordship and your colleagues relative to that treaty. The second head of examination, that on which I am now about to enter, is, the prominent features of your misconduct, *since the conclusion of the peace;* and these I propose to consider in the following order: 1. The press; 2. the French Emigrants and Vendean royalists; 3. Switzerland; 4. French troops in Holland, and the Cape of Good Hope and other Dutch colonies; 5. Malta and Egypt; 6. Louisiana.

1. The PRESS, my lord, has long been a favourite folly in this island; it has done infinite mischief; it has, beyond all comparison, done more harm than good, as to religion and civil liberty, as well as to politics. To the press it is that we owe the innumerable swarms of sectaries, who have, for an hundred and fifty years past, distracted the minds of the people, and in some instances, led them to commit the most detestable and horrid of crimes; to the press we owe all those hard-biting laws, which, though absolutely necessary for the preservation of the peace and the safety of the state, must be regarded as a considerable diminution of the civil liberty, enjoyed by the mass of the people, previous to the prevalent influence of the press; to the press we owe the American rebellion, the rebellion in Ireland, and to the press, the English press, the world owes the rebellion and the ursurpation in France. But, my lord, this most potent instrument, after having been employed in the work of irreligion, civil slavery, and rebellion, became, at the close of the last war, formidable to Buonaparté, not because he was an apostate, a rebel, an ursurper, and a tyrant; but, because, after having established his power, he had become the enemy of the press itself, from a suspicion, that it might produce, with respect to him, effects similar to those which it had produced with respect to his lawful Sovereign. Very easy, therefore, was it to perceive, that he would use his influence to the utmost, in order to silence, with regard to himself and his government, the press of England, and of America, but particularly that of the former country. This his inclination and intention I pointed out more than a year ago, even before the treaty of peace was concluded; and, I stated, at the same time, that he would certainly endeavour to silence also every member of parliament, who should dare to expose his views and justly characterize his conduct (1).—Thus, my lord, you were duly forewarned of this source of altercation and quarrel; and, therefore, it was your duty to have been upon your guard, and to have opposed a resolute or inflexible resistance, against the very first approaches of the ursurper's interference on the subject of the press. Do we find this resolution and inflexibility in your conduct, as exhibited in the correspondence laid before Parliament? No, my lord; we perceive you, in the first instance, adopting a tone well calculated to invite further interference, reiterated demands, and additional insults. If, in answer to OTTO's (your dear friend OTTO's) impudent request to punish *Peltier*, *Cobbett*, and *Regnier* (editor of the Courier de Londres), you had simply observed, that the courts were open, but that neither you nor your colleagues had, or could or would have, any thing to do with the matter, you would have heard no more of these complaints, or the dispute would have been brought to an issue, while the conquered places were yet in our hands; but, instead of this firm and dignified sort of reply, you fell into a strain of explanation made up of that pacific pusillanimity and hacknied pleader-like equivocation, which are so disgustingly apparent in your letter to your friend OTTO of the 28th of July. This letter is a paltry *apology* for the existence of what is called the liberty of the press: you say, that it is "impossible his Majesty's government (meaning the *ministry*, I suppose) "could "peruse the article in question" (an article by Mr. Peltier), "without the greatest dis-

(1) See Register for March 6 and 27, 1802.—Vol. I. p. 221 and 317.

"pleasure, and without an *anxious desire*, "that the person who published it should "suffer the *punishment he so justly deserves*." Then, after lamenting the *inconveniencies* of prosecutions for libel, and the *difficulty* of obtaining judgment against the offenders, you conclude by stating that you have, with regard to the article complained of, referred the matter to the King's Attorney General, "for his opinion *whether it is or is not a libel*." So, my lord, after having declared, that you and your colleagues have read the article with the *greatest displeasure*, after having declared Mr. Peltier to be *justly deserving of punishment*, and that you *anxiously desire* to see him punished; after all this, you acknowledge, that you do not know, whether the article be or be not a libel, whether the publisher be or be not deserving of punishment, of that very punishment, which you *anxiously desire* he should receive! —That this proof of so complying a disposition was well calculated to produce a renewal and perseverance in those attempts, which the French Consul had already made against the press, is certain. When the insolent commissary of prisoners perceived, that you and your worthy colleagues were so ready to join in the condemnation of the persons he accused, and especially when he found you, merely to humour his master, *anxiously desirous* to punish that which you did not know to be a crime; thus encouraged, it was no wonder that he should rise in his demands, and that he should have the audacity, in his letter of the 17th of August, to give to his complaints a retrospective extent, embracing those persons who had "written "volumes to prove the *necessity of the last* "*war against France*," the suppression of which also he would have demanded, and, perhaps, not without success, if you and your colleagues had not feared the consequences as to your own persons.—It is not, however, as a cause of adding to the misunderstanding, and, finally, as contributing towards the rupture which has now taken place, that I am now to consider your letter of the 28th of July; but, as discovering a disposition, on your part, to shackle the press, for the purpose of preserving the friendship of Buonaparté; and, this disposition is, I think, clearly manifested by your expressing the opinion of His Majesty's government that Mr. Peltier deserved punishment, and by declaring your anxious desire to see him suffer punishment, *before* you had been able to ascertain *whether the act he was charged with was a crime or not*. This is the ground of accusation against you, a ground, too, which gathers great strength from the subsequent proceedings against that injured gentleman; for, we now know, that, in consequence of the complaints of the French Minister, Mr. Peltier has been prosecuted for the pretended libel laid to his charge, that the prosecution was grounded upon the precedent cases of Lord George Gordon and Mr. Vint, that the Attorney General stated the relation of an historical fact *not* to come within the just causes for such a prosecution, and, it is notorious, that the matters for which Lord George Gordon and Mr. Vint were prosecuted were, in the strictest sense of the words, relations of historical facts; yet, upon this ground, and in virtue of this doctrine, we have seen Mr. Peltier convicted under a strong charge from the Bench to that effect; but, after an investigation of his case by the public, and after all hopes of keeping peace with Buonaparté had vanished, we have seen the Attorney General refrain from demanding judgement, and we must now regard Mr. Peltier as legally discharged. These circumstances, viewed in conjunction with your letter of the 28th of July, amount to an irrefragable proof of your desire, if not of your intention, to impose shackles on the press, unwarranted by the law of the land.

2. THE FRENCH EMIGRANTS AND VENDEAN ROYALISTS you did not, my lord, consent to drive out of the country; this act of abominable despotism, to which you were moved, was not consummated; but, in your letter of the 28th of August, to suppose the case of the Princes of the house of Bourbon being induced to quit Great Britain; your words are: "His Majesty has no desire, "that they should continue to reside in this "country, if they are disposed, *or can be* "*induced to quit it*;" which appears to me to amount to a pretty clear indication of your intention to urge them so to do; or, in other words, to oblige them to do it, if they should not take the hint in due time.—As to the wearing of the insignia of the orders of French nobility, your lordship thought, that the persons so doing did wrong, though you happened to have no law to prevent, or punish it: "It might be *more proper* if "they all *abstained from it*." And why? why more proper? Because their Sovereign was in exile, and because a rebel had usurped his throne? Was this the reason? Was it thus that you would, under similar circumstances, evince your fidelity to your Sovereign? God send you may never be put to the trial, and let all the people say, *Amen!* This is a tolerable good criterion whereby to judge of your lordship's notions of nobility, of the obligations of honour and of allegiance. Were I your King, you most assuredly would never be exposed to the temp-

tation of committing the base act, here recommended to the French nobility. What a figure does this nation make, in the papers now before Parliament! Never surely was degradation half so complete! But, the worst act of all was, the promise to *transport* GEORGES and his fellow Royalists to Canada. This is denied, or, at least, qualified; but, will any one believe, that the French minister would have spoken of the promise in such confident terms, if no such promise had been made? I *know*, my lord, that an endeavour was made *to accomplish this promise*, and you as well as I know that it failed. To comment on this attempt would be useless: the naked fact is all that is wanted, and that I am sure you dare not deny; if you should, an exposure, not less complete than that respecting the Maltese deputation, shall very soon make its appearance. It is not unnecessary here to observe, however, that this nation was bound, not merely by the ties of gratitude and hospitality, but by bonds still more powerful, to protect *all* the Vendean Royalists, and to make an ample provision for their future support. People in general seem to imagine, that the poor miserable pennies, bestowed as a sort of alms, accompanied with all the insolence of office, are to be regarded as *a favour* towards these gallant gentlemen; but, the fact is, that this nation was bound by the most sacred obligations to make stipulations for them in the treaty of peace, obligations which were basely set at nought. If Oxford and his colleagues deserved impeachment for their conduct towards the Catalans, what, my lord, do the Richmond Park Ministry deserve for their conduct towards the Vendeans?

3. SWITZERLAND, like every other country whereunto France extended her encroachments, was an object worthy the attention of a British ministry; but, having made a remonstrance in favour of the Swiss, how came you to be satisfied without a satisfactory answer, and even without any answer at all? The remonstrance was made on the 10th of October, 1802. Yet, after this you not only kept peace, but proceeded in the surrender of the conquests then remaining in our hands; But, what strikes me as the most singular in this remonstrance, is, that it was grounded on the principles of the treaty of Amiens as viewed in conjunction with the stipulations of that of Luneville, when it is well known, that, during the debates on the former of those treaties, you yourself had declared, that its stipulations were in no-wise connected with those of the latter, and that upon this very ground, you opposed the laying the treaty of Luneville before the Parliament, when a motion for that purpose was, on the 6th of May, 1802, made by Lord Temple, which motion was by your means negatived by the last complying parliament (2).

4. FRENCH TROOPS IN HOLLAND. You complained of the French troops remaining in Holland. The ground of your complaint existed the moment the treaty of Amiens was concluded; yet, from an examination of the papers; in which we are told to look for a justification of your conduct, we find that no remonstrance was ever made on this subject till the month of February, 1803, and even then incidentally; yet you proceeded in the restoration of the Dutch colonies, including the Cape, when you must have known, that the mother country was garrisoned by French troops, and was, to all intents and purposes, an appendage of the French empire. On the 17th of October, you gave orders, in consequence of the French incursion into Switzerland, with which the Dutch had nothing to do, to retain the Dutch colonies: the Cape was retained, or rather, as it happened, recaptured. On the 14th of November you instruct Lord Whitworth to remonstrate about the French troops in Holland; yet, with this proof of your knowledge of the subjugated state of Holland before our eyes, we see you, on the very next day, the 15th of November, sending a counter order to give up the Dutch colonies, and the Cape amongst the rest! Holland being, then, on the 15th of November, in exactly the same state with respect to France as she was in on the 17th of October, it follows of course, that, if she was independent at the later date, she was so at the more early. This, therefore, is the dilemma, to which you are reduced: if Holland was independent, you were, on the 17th of October, guilty of a most scandalous violation of the treaty of Amiens; and, if she was not independent, you knowingly surrendered, on the 15th of November, the Cape into the hands of France, and that, too, after having had repeated and very recent proofs of the hostile intentions of that power.

5. MALTA AND EGYPT.—Your conduct with regard to Malta, as far down as the treaty of Amiens inclusive, has been amply exposed in the publication of the authentic papers relative thereto. The subsequent transactions, the abolition of some of the langues, the consent to a mode of electing the Grand-Master unknown to the treaty, together with all your various pitiful subterfuges about guarantees, are they not written

(2) See Debates, Register, Vol. II. p. 1235.

in the book which you have laid before Parliament, and are they not too ridiculous to merit particular animadversion. But, Malta considered as the out-work of Egypt, and by that means of India; Malta, considered as the final cause of the rupture, and as the ostensible object of the war, cannot be separated from Sebastiani's Report, which was the principal ground on which you resolved, as you say, not to give it up. When, therefore, did you first hear of this report? In January, 1803. But, my lord, though you had not seen the *report* before January, you were, as appears by your letter of the 30th of November, at that more early period informed of *the arrival of Sebastiani in Egypt*; and who can doubt, that you were by the same means, duly informed of his offensive language, and of the evident object of his mission? Yet, after the receipt of this information, you not only gave orders to evacuate Egypt, but we find you professing an intention to lose no time in evacuating Malta also! With this evidence before our eyes, can we possibly regard Sebastiani's Report, which only gives a detailed account of the least hostile part of his conduct in Egypt; is it possible that we can regard it as being, with respect to the present war, any thing more than a mere pretext, a mere disguise to the real motives, by which you and your colleagues were actuated in deferring the surrender of Malta? These motives were, first to have something in hand, as a security against the consequences which you expected to arise from your retention of the Cape, if that retention happened to take place; something about which to make a quarrel, whereby to form a plausible pretext for the arming of the country, if the news of the retention of the Cape should arise previous to that of its final surrender, and which pretext was at last brought forward in the message, which His Majesty was advised to send to the Parliament on the 8th of March. I have, my lord, before given it as my decided opinion, that the news of the retention of the Cape, was the *immediate* cause of the message, which opinion has not been, in the smallest degree, shaken by the papers before Parliament, notwithstanding the 18th of March is stated to be the day, when you received the *dispatch* of General Dundas, giving an account of his having executed your orders for that retention. You do not say, nor can you say, my lord, that you *did not*, through another channel, receive more early information of that event. You dare not say, that you did not receive the intelligence, on which you acted, on the 5th or 6th of March; and I say, that I am fully persuaded you did; a persuasion which is not at all impaired by any statement made by the present ministry, that ministry who denied having any official document relative to the laws and constitution of Malta; that ministry who have declared that they never heard of the Maltese deputies having been refused an official audience; that ministry who are now accused to the world, and with every appearance of justice, of having suppressed a very material part of Lord Whitworth's note to Talleyrand of the 10th of May, which note they present to the Parliament as being entire: by any statement of such men, my opinion, as to the matter in question is not to be altered, and I remain fully convinced, that if the order for the final evacuation of the Cape had overtaken the order for its retention, the hostile message would not even yet have reached the houses of Parliament.—There were, however, other motives. A war was necessary for the purpose of creating circumstances sufficient to render the financial statements of Mr. Addington no longer applicable. The deficit, the alarming deficit was discovered. No hopes of a commercial treaty could be entertained. In short, the whole finance system, the whole of the system for "husbanding our resources against another "day of trial," had proved abortive. Instead of increasing the "capital, credit and con- "fidence," which were to give us strength and security, the peace was found to have placed the funds absolutely in the power of Buonaparté, who, through that channel, drew from us the means of maintaining the army destined to invade and subdue us; and thus "the horrors of war" became necessary to prevent the approaching and greater horrors of peace. It was not, therefore, for the possession of Malta, and, through it, for the defence of Egypt and the security of India that we were called on to arm; but, generally, to put an end to the peace, and particularly, to be prepared for the consequences that might result from the intelligence of our having retained, or recaptured, the Cape of Good Hope.

6. LOUISIANA is the last topic, on which I proposed to speak to your Lordship; and, a very important topic it is.—I stated, in my former letter, the advantages which our enemy has derived from the cession of this colony, in consequence of the peace: I am now to show, how this might have been prevented, and what advantages we might have derived from a *more speedy termination* of that peace. The Louisiana expedition was ready to sail at the moment when the King's first message was delivered. If we had brought the negotiation to a close immediately, and had had a small squadron to

send to sea with four thousand men on board, we might have taken Louisiana before Mr. Munro had reached France. Having done this, the Americans might have received the country from *our* hands, by which means France would have still owed the United States 30,000,000 of dollars, instead of wiping off that debt and that source of misunderstanding and receiving in addition, as she now has done, 2,000,000 of dollars from the people of that country, at the same time that she is by them regarded as a benefactress.—Of all the traits of *modesty* discovered by you and your colleagues, that of claiming *merit* for having, by your dispute with France, caused this arrangement between her and America is certainly the most remarkable. After having asserted, that the peace was not injurious on account of the cession which it sanctioned of this immense and valuable territory; after having gone so far as to declare, that this cession was *advantageous* to Great Britain, because it would attach the Americans to her by placing the French upon their back; after all this you do not blush to boast of having done away the effects of this salutary cession, and that, too, by a renewal of the war!—That Louisiana is in the hands of the Americans I sincerely rejoice; but, I am by no means pleased, that France has, by this transfer, obtained £7,000,000 sterling, and, which is of still more value, a decided influence in America, neither of which she would ever have obtained had not the cession to her been sanctioned by the Treaty of Amiens. Inasmuch, therefore, as the arrangement between France and America is an evil, it is the effect of the peace; and, inasmuch as it is a good, it is the effect of the renewal of war, of the mere sound of war, of "horrid war," of that which you and your colleagues have taught the people of this country to regard as an evil unattended with any good, an evil to avoid which no sacrifice either of interest or of honour could possibly be too great.—But, my lord, your claim of *merit*, on this score, is certainly the most extraordinary that ever was set up: you first, by the peace of Amiens, sanction the cession of Louisiana to France, for, till that sanction was given, she could derive no advantage from the country; she dared not even say it was hers: you first create the evil, and when, afterwards, the evil is mitigated, by a renewal of war, *by a total frustration of your own plans*, you have the confidence to assume to yourselves merit for that mitigation! Merit for having been, against your will, prevented from doing so much mischief as you intended to do!

Here, my Lord, I conclude my remarks on the conduct of you and your colleagues, relative to the negotiations with France, since the conclusion of the Treaty of Amiens. It is to this treaty, together with that of Downing-street, to which, I have to attribute the honour of corresponding with your Lordship; and, though you have not condescended to answer directly, any of my numerous letters, I have had the satisfaction to perceive, that, you have, in several instances, answered them indirectly, or, at least, endeavoured so to do. From the moment you began negotiating with the commissary of prisoners, I foresaw the result of that negotiation; from the moment the Preliminary Treaty was concluded, I foresaw and foretold its consequences, even in the minutest detail; I have followed, or rather gone before you, step by step, through the whole of your diplomatic career, faithfully warning you against every danger, and not less faithfully exposing your errors. In return for all this, I am told, my Lord, that you have intended to confer on me some special marks of your gratitude, a little à la Peltier or so; and, if your power, or your courage, has fallen short of your wishes, be assured, my Lord, that I take the will for the deed ——I am, my Lord, your, &c. &c.

Duke Street, Westminster,
3d June, 1803. WM. COBBETT.

PARLIAMENTARY MINUTES, *from p. 672.*

Thursday April 28.—LORDS.—Progress made in the second reading of Markham's Divorce-Bill. Deferred 'till to-morrow.—Lord Viscount Bulkley sworn and took his seat. Several Bills before the House forwarded.—COMMONS.—Committees appointed to try the elections for Taunton and Boston.—Agreed to call the House over on Thursday next.—Lord Folkestone moved for copies of dispatches to and from the officer or officers commanding at the Cape of Good Hope, which motion, after a debate of some length, was superseded by another for the order of the day, which was moved for by the Chancellor of the Exchequer.—Mr. Fox presented a petition in behalf of certain persons of Nottingham, against the Bill, then pending, relative to the opening of their borough and county to the magistrates of the shire of Nottingham. Ordered to lie on the table.—Lord Castlereagh moved for accounts of all the goods sold at the India Company's sales from 1st of March, 1802, to 1st March 1803. Also of the stock of the East India Company. Ordered. He then moved for leave to bring in a Bill to enable the East India Company to raise and pay a volunteer corps of two companies.

Friday, April 29.——LORDS.—Progress made in the examinations respecting the claim of the Rev. Mr. Brydges to the Barony of Chandos.—Further discussions on Markham's Divorce Bill, which was ordered to be printed.—The Sailor's and Soldier's Relief Bill and the vexatious Arrest's Bill went through a committee of the whole.—Second reading of the Insolvent Debtor's Bill postponed.—Committment of the Irish Chaulking Bill defer-

ed for a month.——COMMONS.—Mr. Lascelles brought up a petition from the Yorkshire Clothiers for the repeal of certain laws relative to their trade.—Counsel heard against the Nottingham Magistrate Bill. Motion for the said Bill's going into a committee. A debate thereon. Motion carried without a division. Bill ordered to be committed on Monday next.

Monday, May 2.——LORDS.—Lord Auckland moved to postpone the second reading of the Irish Bank Restriction Bill 'till to-morrow. Agreed to. —He then moved for certain financial documents, and, in his preface to the said motion, he stated *that the net revenue of the country would be found to exceed* 34 *millions sterling, of which, after deducting about* 17,600,000 *for the discharge of the national debt, there would be the sum of* 16,400,000 *applicable to public purposes.*—Motion agreed to.—Lord Darnley moved for the House to be summoned for Monday next in order to submit to them a motion on the state of the country. Ordered.——COMMONS.—Mr. Patterson presented a petition from the Norwich Weavers against the Woollen Manufactures Bill before the House. Read and referred to a committee.—Order of the day being read for taking into consideration the consolidation of the custom duties, the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to postpone the subject 'till Monday, when, or before, he hoped to have a communication to make.—Mr. Patten put off his promised motion. —On the third reading of the Edinburgh Road Bill, the House divided—Ayes 116, Noes 106.—Coroner's Bill ordered to be engrossed.—Progress in the Nottingham Magistrates' Bill.

Tuesday, May 3.——LORDS.—Order of the day: second reading of the Irish Bank Restriction Bill. Lords, King, Limerick, and Auckland spoke on the subject.—— COMMONS.—Third reading of the Nottingham Bill. After a debate there appeared for the bill, 164, against 29. Bill passed. —Progress made in discussing the clauses of the Clergy Residence Bill.

Wednesday, May 4.——LORDS.—Progress made in Markham's Divorce-Bill. —— COMMONS.—Droitwich Road-Bill passed.—On a proposed motion, on the Navy Abuse Commission, by Sir H. St. J. Mildmay, a debate ensued, during which some remarkable declarations fell from Capt. Markham (on the Lords of the Admiralty,) and from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Sir H. Mildmay withdrew his motion.

Thursday, May 5.——LORDS.—In a committee of the whole, on the Irish Bank Restriction Bill, two new clauses, moved by Lord King, were rejected. —— COMMONS.—Election for Taunton confirmed.—Bill relative to Scotch Schoolmasters discussed. Boast of the Lord Advocate about the morals of the Scotch.—General Gascoygne moved for papers relative to duties on coffee. Mr. W. Dundas made a strange remark: "that the House "should not grant papers merely to *gratify curi-* "*osity!*" Reproved by Dr. Laurence.—John Simpson, Mayor of Great Grimsby was, after a debate and a hearing of his counsel, ordered, on the motion of Mr. Burdon, to be committed to Newgate. —On motion of Mr. Gregor papers relative to corn &c. imported since October, 1802, were ordered to be laid before the House.—Progress made in the Clergy Non-residence Bill.

Friday, May 6.——LORDS.—After some debate on Lord Moira's Bill relative to Insolvent Debtors, it was laid aside for the present session.—Upon a motion by Ministers for adjourning 'till Monday a debate took place, which ended in a division, for it 29 against it 8.——COMMONS.—A new writ issued for Boston in lieu of Mr. Fydell.—A message from the Lords, who had agreed to the Irish Bank Restriction Bill.—On a motion made by Ministers for an adjournment to Monday, a debate took place. Divided, Ayes 185, Noes 95. — James Trotter called to the bar, reprimanded and discharged upon paying his fees.—Progress made in the Irish Courts of Law Bill.

Monday, May 9.—LORDS.—In a Committee progress was made in discussing the Chandos claim.—Papers presented relative to Queen Anne's Bounty.—Some conversation on the state of the dispute with France.—A paper presented relative to Field Officers serving in the Militia.—— COMMONS.—First reading of a Bill for the free sale of Coals in London.—Papers brought up relative to Queen Anne's Bounty.—Lords ask for evidence relative to the Nottingham Election.— London Port Bill went through a Committee.— Papers brought up relative to the exportation of gunpowder, &c.—Some conversation relative to the dispute with France.

Tuesday, May 10.—LORDS.—Upon motion of the Duke of Athol that the Edinburgh Road Bill be read a third time on Thursday next, the Duke of Norfolk divided the House: for the reading 65, against it 15.—Progress made in Markham's Divorce Bill.——COMMONS.—Upon a third reading of the Coroner's Bill a division took place, for the bill 67. against it 63.—Bill thrown out.—The report of the Committee on the Kircudbright Election, stated that Montgomery Stuart, Esq. ought to have been, and therefore was, duly elected.—A motion was made by the Minister for postponing the consideration of the Election Petitions which stood on the list for this Session.—Motion withdrawn.—A petition brought in from certain Tanners in Ireland.—Progress made in the Clergy Non-residence Bill.

Wednesday, May 11.—LORDS.—Papers relative to finance, moved for by Lord Auckland, laid before the House.—Order of Council presented relating to the exportation of pig-iron and warlike stores ——COMMONS.—Ordered, upon motion of Mr. Bagwell, that the Clerks of the Peace of the several counties of Ireland lay before the House a return of freeholders.—Bill for East-India Company's Volunteers read a third time and passed.—Lunatic Estate Bill read a third time and passed.—Progress made in the Irish Courts of Law Bill.—Progress made in the Clergy Non-residence Bill.

Thursday, May 12.—LORDS.—Further progress made in the Scotch Appeal, and in the Chandos claim.—On the third reading of the Edinburgh Road Bill the House divided, for it 69, against it 19.—Nottingham Magistrate Bill read a second time.—First report presented from the Commissaries of Naval Abuses.——COMMONS.—Committees appointed for trying the elections of Cirencester and Bishop's Castle.—Report from the Commissaries under the Naval Abuse Bill.—Motion for papers relative to Irish distilleries. Ordered.—Bill of indemnity moved for relative to the exportation of corn to Denmark. Debate thereon. Leave given to bring in the bill.— Further progress made in discussing the Clergy Non-residence Bill. Report thereon brought up, and the bill ordered to be printed.

Friday, May 13.—LORDS.—East-India Company's Volunteers Bill brought up from the Commons.—Order of the day, financial discussion. Lord King, at the close of a speech of considerable length, moved for "a Committee for the pur- "pose of inquiring into the real situation of the

"finances of the country." The motion was opposed by Lord Auckland. Lords Moira and Grenville then spoke for the motion. Lord Westmoreland spoke against it, and it was negatived without a division.—A bill moved for by Lord Ellenborough to punish persons concerned in wilfully sinking ships, &c. &c. Bill read first time.—On motion of Lord Pelham the House adjourned to Monday.——COMMONS.—London Coal Market Bill read a second time.—Bishop's Castle Election confirmed. The petition against, vexatious and groundless.—Militia Families Bill read a third time and passed.—Irish Courts of Law Bill read a third time and passed.—On the motion of Lord Grenville Levison, "that the House should at its rising adjourn to to-morrow," a debate ensued, and the motion was withdrawn. It was then moved, by the Minister, that the House adjourn to Monday, which was carried without a division.

Monday, May 16.—LORDS.—Nottingham Magistrate Bill read a third time.—The following Message from the King was read:——"GEORGE "R.—His Majesty thinks it proper to acquaint "the House of Commons, that the discussions "which he announced to them in his Message of "the 8th of March last, as then subsisting be"tween his Majesty and the French Government, "have been terminated. That the conduct of "the French Government has obliged his Ma"jesty to recall his Ambassador from Paris, and "that the Ambassador from the French Repub"lic, has left London. His Majesty has given "directions for laying before the House of Com"mons, with as little delay as possible, copies of "such papers as will afford the fullest informa"tion to his Parliament at this important junc"ture——It is a consolation to his Majesty to "reflect, that no endeavours have been wanting "on his part to preserve to his subjects the "blessings of peace; but under the circum"stances which have occurred to disappoint his "just expectations, his Majesty relies with con"fidence on the zeal and public spirit of his "faithful Commons, and on the exertions of his "brave and loyal subjects, to support him in his "determination to employ the power and re"sources of the nation, in opposing the spirit of "ambition and encroachment which at present "actuates the Councils of France, in upholding "the dignity of his crown, and in asserting and "maintaining the rights and interests of his "people."

COMMONS.—Report on the Cirencester Election declared Sir Robert Preston and Mr. Beach to be duly elected.—A Message from the Lords, stated that they had agreed to the Nottingham Magistrate and other bills without any alteration in them.—Indemnity Bill read a second time.—Leave given to bring in a bill to amend the Medicine Act.—King's Message (see Lords of this day) read. Motion by Lord Hawkesbury to take it into consideration on Monday next.—Motion by Lord Castlereagh for leave to bring in a bill to amend the Act of the 39th of the King, allowing the East-India Company to hire ships for their service. Referred to a Committee of the whole House to-morrow.—Report of the Clergy Bill postponed till Wednesday next.—Committee of the whole House on the bill to prevent vexatious arrests.

Tuesday, May 17.——LORDS.—Progress made in the Chandos claim. The Royal assent was given by commission to 36 public and private bills, amongst which was the Nottingham Magistrate Bill. A committee of the whole on the Lunatic's Estates Bill, on which the report was ordered to be received to-morrow.——COMMONS.—Markham's Divorce Bill read a second time.——A petition was presented from John Simpson, late Mayor of Great Grimsby, and now in confinement in Newgate, by order of the House, praying to be discharged.—Ordered that Simpson be brought up on Thursday next.—Mr. Hawkins Browne moved certain resolutions relating to emigration, upon which a Bill was ordered to be brought in.—General Gascoyne gave notice that, if the papers about to be presented, relative to the negotiation with France, did not include papers touching matters which passed previous to the Definitive Treaty, he should move for such papers, particularly those relating to Malta and the Italian Republic. The ministers stated, that it was their intention to lay before the House such papers only as related to discussions, which had arisen since the Treaty of Amiens.—Order of the day for a committee of the whole on the consolidation of the Custom-Duties. The report to be received to-morrow.

Wednesday, May 18.——COMMONS.—Mr. Grey moved for the substance of any intelligence relative to the military preparations carrying on in the ports of Holland and France. After some observations from the Chancellor of the Exchequer the motion was withdrawn.—The consideration of the report on the Ilchester election was resumed, and after an argument of some length, Mr. Rose moved "that the House do agree with the "committee in the said resolution that Alexander "Davison was involved in the said system of "bribery and corruption." The motion was opposed by Mr. Wallace and the Master of the Rolls, and supported by Mr. Bragge and Mr. Sturgess, and after some debate was carried, Ayes, 56—Noes, 47.—Another motion was then made, "that the Attorney General be directed to pro"secute Alexander Davison for the same of"fence," which was agreed to. Ayes, 60—Noes, 39.——Report on the Clergy Residence Bill agreed to, and ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

Thursday, May 19.——COMMONS.—Committee appointed for trying the elections of Evesham and East Retford. Mr. Grey moved for papers, 1st. relative to that part of the declaration which stated that violence had been offered to the vessels and property of his Majesty's subjects; 2d. relative to the commercial agents of France; 3d. relative to the date of the instructions which had been sent to the French agent at Dublin; 4th. relative to the sending of French troops into Holland; 5th. relative to the remonstrance which had been made against the review presented to the Legislative Body of France; 6th. relative to the reply of the French to the note presented by Lord Whitworth on the subject of Switzerland; 7th. relative to the orders sent out to retain the Cape and other places; 8th. relative to the cession of Louisiana by France to America; 9th. relative to the armaments in the ports of France and Holland. The motion was opposed by Lords Hawkesbury and Castlereagh and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and supported by Mr. Whitbread, Dr. Lawrence, and Mr. Windham.——The question was then put on the several resolutions, when the first, third, and eighth were carried; on the second, fourth, fifth, and sixth the previous question was moved by Lord Hawkesbury, and carried.—On the seventh Lord Folkestone moved the following amendment: "And also the date when the dispatches were received in England, announcing the reten-

ion of the Cape of Good Hope." The motion as amended was then carried.——On the ninth resolution the House divided.——For it 136—Against it 59.—Majority 77.

Friday, May 20 ——LORDS.—Counsel heard relative to the Scotch appeal, which was deferred to Tuesday.—Earls Strathmore and Rochfort, Viscount Middleton and Lord Foley were sworn, and took their seats.—Bills on the table forwarded.—Gold and Silver Bullion Bill brought from the House of Commons, and several private Bills, all which were read.—Lord Boringdon moved for information concerning the violence offered to the vessels of his Majesty's subjects, for which no redress had been obtained, &c.; also concerning the arrest of Captain D'Auvergne; also concerning the *centre projet* respecting Malta. These motions his Lordship after some observations from Lord Pelham, declined urging at this time. Lord Fitzwilliam moved for information concerning the commercial agents; but, after some debate in which Lords Pelham, Carlisle, Hobart, and Spencer bore a part, he agreed to postpone it.——COMMONS.—On motion of Mr. Hawkins Browne, a new writ was ordered to be issued for electing a Burgess for Nottingham, in the room of Joseph Birch, Esq. whose election has been declared void.——Committee to try the election of Evesham reported that the sitting member was duly elected, and that the petition was neither frivolous nor vexatious. —Secretary at War, moved for leave to bring in a bill, for speedily completing the Militia, &c. which, after some observations from Mr. Windham and others, was granted.——Lord Hawkesbury presented several papers, relating the subjects noticed by Mr. Grey, upon which a long and interesting debate took place between Lord Hawkesbury, Mr. Grey, Mr. Canning, Mr. Sheridan, Mr. Whitbread, Dr. Lawrence, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer.——General Gascoine moved, 1st for a copy of all the representations or remonstrances made by ministers on the part of Malta from the 1st. of March, 1801, to the last of March, 1802, &c.; 2d. for a copy of all such representations or remonstrances as were made by the British Government on the subject of the Italian Republic, and the annexation of Piedmont, previous and subsequent to the Treaty of Amiens; 3d. for a copy of all orders sent to any Governor, &c. in the West Indies, since the treaty; 4th. for an account of the remonstrance, &c. made respecting the continuance of the French troops in Holland. After considerable discussion the previous question was carried against all the motions except the third which was agreed to.——Bill for the defence of the country read, and committed.—Indemnity Bill discussed in committee of the whole, and the report ordered to be received on Monday.— An engrossed Bill from the Lords, for punishing persons burning ships at sea, &c. read, and ordered to be printed.——Third reading of the Clergy Non-Residence Bill, postponed till Thursday.——Land Redemption Bill read, and ordered to be read a second time on Monday.——Committees of Supply, and of Ways and Means postponed till Monday.——Third reading of the Bill for preventing vexatious arrests postponed till Monday.

Monday, May 23.——LORDS.—Marquis of Salisbury reported that the King would be pleased to give directions for the production of the papers solicited by their Lordships.——St. Pancras Workhouse Bill rejected on motion of Lord Moira —— Order of the day for considering his Majesty's message being read, Lord Pelham rose, and concluded a long speech with moving, "That an humble address be presented to his Majesty, to "return his Majesty the thanks of this House for "his most gracious message, and for the communication of the several papers which have been "laid before them in obedience to his Majesty's "command.——To assure his Majesty of the just "sense we entertain of his Majesty's anxious and "uniform endeavours to preserve to his people "the blessings of peace, and our perfect confidence in his Majesty's disposition to terminate "the calamities of war, whenever that object can "be accomplished, consistently with the honour "of his Majesty's Crown, and the interests of his "people.——That we have observed, with the "strongest feelings of indignation, that his Majesty's endeavours have been frustrated by that "restless spirit of ambition and domination by which "the government of France had been led to advance "pretensions the most extravagant and injurious, "and to avow designs at once inconsistent with "obligations of good faith, and with the essential interests of the British Empire, and that for "these indignities and provocations his Majesty "has in vain demanded satisfaction and redress. "That actuated by these sentiments we feel it "our indispensable duty to express, on our part, "a firm determination to co-operate with his Majesty, in calling forth the resources of the United Kingdom for the vigorous support of a "cause, in which are involved the dignity of his "Majesty's Crown, the rights and liberties of his "people, and all that is dear and valuable to us "as a free and independent nation."——He was seconded by the Duke of Cumberland, and supported by the Duke of Clarence, Lords Mulgrave, and Melville. Lord King moved the following amendment, in place of what followed the words "his Majesty's commands," "To assure his Majesty of our firm determination to co-operate "with his Majesty in calling forth the resources of "the United Kingdom, for the vigorous prosecution of the war in which we are involved, and "to express to his Majesty the satisfaction with "which his faithful Peers have received his Majesty's gracious Declaration, that he is willing "to afford, as far as may be consistent with his "own honours and the interests of his people, "every facility to any just arrangement by which "the blessings of peace may be restored to his "loyal subjects."—Which after a very long debate between Lords Ellenborough, Moira, Spencer, Rosslyn, and Grenville, was negatived, 142 to 10. —Address put and carried.——COMMONS.—An address similar to the one proposed in the House of Lords was proposed in the House of Commons by Lord Hawkesbury, and supported by Mr. Pitt. Messrs. Erskine and Grey opposed it, and an amendment similar to the one proposed in the House of Lords, was proposed by Mr. Grey. The debate was adjourned till to-morrow.

Tuesday, May 24.——LORDS.—Scotch Appeal postponed till Wednesday fortnight.—Marquis of Salisbury informed the House that the King would receive their address to-morrow.——Bills on the table forwarded.——After some conversation between Lords Darnly and Auckland, a motion relative to the productions of papers on Louisiana, the Cape, &c. was agreed to.—— COMMONS.—The County Bridge Bill and Ship Passenger Bill postponed till to-morrow.——Leave given to bring in a bill to regulate the Court of Appeal in the High Court of Admiralty in Scotland.—— Papers from the Office of Chief Secretary of Ireland presented, read and ordered to be printed.——Mi-

litia Bill read a second time and committed.——Leave given to bring in a bill for the better protection of trade.——Papers relative to the negotiation were presented by Lord Hawkesbury and ordered to lie on the table.——On the motion of Lord Grenville, a motion for copies of all representations made respecting the continuance of French troops in Holland, &c. was agreed to.——On the Address to his Majesty a long debate took place between Messrs. Grenville, Whitbread, Dallas, Elliot, Canning, Fox, and Windham. The amendment proposed by Mr. Grey was negatived 393 to 67, and the original motion put and carried.

Wednesday, May 25.—LORDS.—After waiting upon his Majesty, and transacting some business of a private nature, a motion was made by the Earl of Suffolk, praying that his Majesty would order copies of the surveys taken, and the report of the inspector of the Caledonian Canal, between the Highlands and the Western Sea, to be laid before the House.—Lord Hobart presented a Message from his Majesty respecting his intention of calling out the Supplementary Militia.—Lord Hobart moved an Address, which, after some observations from the Earl of Radnor was agreed to.—Lord Pelham presented by command of his Majesty several State Papers, which were ordered to lie on the table.——COMMONS.—Lord Stopford informed the House that his Majesty would receive their Address to-morrow.—Counsel heard on Markham's Divorce Bill.—A Message from the Lords, stating their agreement to the Bullion Bill, and several private bills.—— Soldier's Pass-Bill postponed till to-morrow.—National Defence Bill read and ordered to be engrossed.—Col. Patton gave notice of his intentions to bring forward certain resolutions relative to the conduct of ministers on Friday next.—Mr. Grenville moved for papers, 1st, for ascertaining the date of the annexation of the Spanish Langue of the Order of St. John to Spain; 2d, such representations as had been made to the French and Spanish Governments on the subject; 3d. the answer to the Emperor of Russia's proposition respecting the guarantee of Malta. The first and last were agreed to.—Mr. Sheridan gave notice that he should move, on Friday, for information concerning the Commercial Agents.—Lord Hawkesbury laid before the House, by command of his Majesty, copies of papers concerning the French troops in Holland, which were ordered to be printed.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer presented the following Message from his Majesty.—"GEORGE R.—"His Majesty thinks it proper to acquaint the "House of Commons, that he has judged it ne"cessary to adopt, without delay, all the means "within his power, which may contribute to de"feat the avowed designs of the enemy, and to "afford the most effectual protection and security "to his faithful people——In pursuance, there"fore, of the Acts of Parliament, enabling his "Majesty to increase the number of his Militia "Forces, his Majesty makes this communication "to the House of Commons, to the end that his "Majesty may cause the Supplementary Militia "to be forthwith raised and enrolled, and there"after to be drawn out, and embodied, and "marched as occasion may require." G. R.——The Message being read,—The Secretary at War moved, "That an humble Address be presented "to his Majesty, to return his Majesty the thanks "of this House for his most gracious Message, "which affords a fresh proof of his Majesty's so"licitude for the security and defence of his peo"ple." Ordered.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer gave notice, that on Monday se'nnight he should propose the Ways and Means for raising the Supplies.—Mr. Fox gave notice, that on Friday next he should move an Address to his Majesty on the subject of making an application to the Emperor of Russia for his Mediation between us and France, &c.—The ballots for Committees on the elections of Newcastle-under-Line and Radnorshire were postponed till Friday next.—Report of the address on the War was read a first time, and, after considerable debate, was received.—Bill for punishing persons setting fire to ships read a second time and committed for to-morrow.—Committee of the whole House for the better regulation of trade reported.—Land Tax Redemption Bill considered in Committee of the whole House. Report to be received to-morrow.

Thursday, May 26.—LORDS.—After a long conversation relative to the notice which Lord Fitzwilliam had previously given of his intention of bringing forward some motions this evening, Lord Grenville made three motions respecting Malta (similar to those moved by Mr. Grenville in the Commons yesterday) which were decided as they had been.—Lord Carlisle moved for papers relative to the French troops in Holland, which were ordered.—The Earl of Radnor made a motion for the proceedings which had taken place towards carrying the 2d article of the Treaty of Amiens into effect, which, after some conversation was negatived.—The Duke of Norfolk presented to the House, a letter he had from the Claimants of the Chandos Peerage, which was referred to the Committee of Privileges.—The order of the day on the motion of Lord Fitzwilliam was discharged and renewed for Thursday.—On the motion of Lord Fitzwilliam, certain papers relative to the annexation of Parma and Placentia were ordered.——COMMONS.—The Speaker informed the House that his Majesty had been waited upon with the Address of that House, to which his Majesty was pleased to return a most gracious answer, "thanking his faithful Commons for their very "loyal and dutiful Address, and expressing his "Majesty's high gratification at the assurance it "contained of their support, in the present con"test undertaken for the maintenance of the ho"nour of his Majesty's Crown, and the preserva"tion of the dearest rights and interests of the "people."—A Message from the Lords stated, that they had agreed to the Militia Bill, and the Bill to prevent vexatious Arrests.—Committee of the election of East Renford reported the sitting members to be duly elected, and the petition to be neither frivolous or vexatious.—Clergy Non-Residence Bill read a third time, and after some debate between Sir F. Burdett, the Attorney-General, Mr. Windham, and Sir W. Scott, Mr. Burdon proposed a clause to exempt licensed preachers of Proprietary Chapels, which was not agreed to. Mr. Pole Carew proposed the following clause, "That patrons shall have the power, on "presenting to a living, to render that living "void in case of non-residence, by giving him six "months notice." Mr. Fellowes proposed a clause giving to the patron of a living, or the churchwardens of a parish, a right of appeal to the Archbishop, where they conceived that leave of absence had been improperly granted; which, after some conversation, was negatived. Mr. Sheridan proposed an amendment, provided that nothing herein contained shall extend, or be construed to extend, so as to subject any spiritual person holding by lease any lands, tenements, or

hereditaments, previous to the 6th of April, 1803, to any penalties for cultivating the same. After a conversation of some length the bill passed, 50 to 5.

Friday, May 27.—LORDS.—Counsel in the Appeal, Marshall v. Stein. On motion of the Lord Chancellor, the judgment was affirmed with the annexation of £150 costs.—Royal assent given by commission to 14 public and private bills.—Much private business done.—Lord Pelham presented, by command of his Majesty, several State Papers, which were ordered to lie on the table.—Various bills were forwarded.—The Exporter's Indemnity Bill and Scotch Schoolmaster's Bill severally went through Committees of the House.—The Irish Courts of Law Bill underwent some discussion in the Committee of the whole House, and their report was ordered for Wednesday.——COMMONS.—After some other business had been gone through, Col. Patton deferred his motion to this day se'nnight.—Mr. Canning moved, "That an "humble Address be presented to his Majesty, "praying, that his Majesty would be graciously "pleased to order to be laid before the House, "copies of any orders for the removal of the per-"sons from this country calling themselves Com-"mercial Commissioners from France, and also "copies of any communications which passed "between this Government and that of France, "relative to the mission of such persons." Ordered.—Sir G. Cornwall gave notice of his intention to move, on Wednesday, for leave to bring in a bill to regulate the Turnpike Act.—Lord Folkstone, of his intention to move, on Wednesday, for certain papers relative to the execution of the 2d article of the Treaty of Amiens.—After a speech of considerable length, Mr. Fox moved, "That an humble Address be presented to his "Majesty, praying that his Majesty would be "graciously pleased to avail himself of the dispo-"sition expressed by the Emperor of Russia, to "interpose his good offices for the termination "of the present war between his Majesty and the "French Republic, an interposition which would, "probably, be attended with the best advantages, "in support of the dignity of his Majesty's "Crown, and for the general and permanent tran-"quillity of Europe." After some debate between Lord Hawkesbury, Mr. Pitt, and Mr. Fox, the motion was withdrawn.—Militia Regulation Bill considered in a Committee of the whole House, and afterwards ordered to be engrossed and read a third time on Wednesday.—Ship Burning Bill considered in a Committee of the whole House.—Custom Duty Bill read and ordered for Wednesday.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer moved, that the House go into a Committee, on Wednesday, on the subject of assessed taxes.—Committees of Supply and of Ways and Means postponed till Wednesday.——Ships Passengers Bill to be read a third time on Wednesday.——Convoy Bill read a second time and committed for Wednesday.——Land Tax Bill considered, and after some amendments ordered to be read a third time on Wednesday.——Adjourned, on account of the Whitsun holidays, to Wednesday, the 1st. of June.

Wednesday, June 1.—LORDS.—The Clergy Bill was ordered to be read a second time on Tuesday next.—Irish Courts' Bill read a third time and passed, as was the Scotch Schoolmasters' Bill.—Several bills will be brought up from the Commons.——COMMONS.—Land Tax Redemption Bill read a third time and passed.—Soldiers' Relief Bill committed.—Order for second reading of the East-India Shipping Bill postponed till Monday.—Convoy Bill went through the Committee; reported.—Leave to bring in a Bill for further repairing the Port of London.—Mr. Canning rose to give notice of a motion which he intended to make to morrow for some papers, the nature of which he should briefly state. The first was for copies of all the Remonstrances made to his Majesty's ministers by the natives of Malta, respecting the intended restoration of that Island to the Order of St. John, and of all the correspondence of ministers on that subject. It appeared from the official Papers published by the French government, that the disposition of the people of Malta had formed the subject of considerable discussion during the Negotiation at Amiens. He should therefore move for an account of the conferences between Lord Cornwallis and the French Plenipotentiary, on the 18th and 19th of February, relative to the inhabitants of Malta, and copies of the dispatches received by his Majesty's ministers on that subject from Lord Cornwallis.——The Customs Consolidation Bill read a second time.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

THE TRUE BRITON, in order, we suppose, to out-strip its fellows in that anti-gallican zeal, of which it has, for several months past discovered such a plentiful deficiency, has, during the last week published a paper, purporting to be a memorial from Talleyrand to Buonaparté, pointing out the means by which this country is to be destroyed in peace. As to the matter contained in this curious state paper we can certainly have no objection, seeing that it is, in substance, borrowed from our writings; but, with respect to the *authenticity* of the paper itself we must beg leave to doubt, especially as we know, that a copy of it was in possession of the editors of the Anti-Jacobin Review *some months ago*, and that they considered it as **un**authentic, is very evident from the slight attention they paid to it. The fact is, that the fabrication is too gross to impose on any person of sense, a circumstance, however, which by no means renders it less suited to the readers of the True Briton and the Sun, whose powers of perception we should not suppose to rise much superior to those of the more intelligent species of quadrupeds. There is a wonderful pliancy which seems to prevail in the mind of Mr. Heriot. The really authentic papers published by France, some time ago, against this country, he never could be brought to acknowledge as such, though they were published in Buonaparté's official gazette; whereas he now discovers all the marks of authenticity in a paper, which, we dare say, has reached him through the two-penny post, and which, without the least investigation or reflection, he believes in good earnest, or affects to believe, has actually been purloined from the escrutoire of Talleyrand or Buonaparté! But, whatever motive may have led to the publication in question, we

cannot but regard it as a most foolish act, to speak of it in the mildest terms. No cause was ever assisted by base and dishonourable means, and of such means, the basest and most dishonourable, is, the employing of fabricated letters, a device totally unworthy of any one above a courtizan or a stock-jobber.

GARBLED STATE PAPER. If, then, it be unjustifiable in a mere news-printer to publish a fabricated paper, what epithet shall we affix to similar conduct in the officers of government, in ministers of state? The French government has accused the British ministry, in the face of the world, of garbling one of the official notes, presented by Lord Whitworth to Talleyrand, and, by the means of such garbling, of exhibiting a misrepresentation to the parliament and the country, as well as to foreign courts and nations. Much as we dislike the ministers, great as our resentment against them must be, on account of the injury and disgrace they have brought upon us, in common with the rest of His Majesty's subjects, we should, for the honour of our country, gladly exert whatever power we may possess to remove this infamous imputation; but, upon a careful examination of the papers, a regard for truth and for the reputation of our work compels us to confess, that, at present, we think there are strong reasons to fear, that, by some means or other, a very material part of the note alluded to, has been suppressed, in that copy of the papers which has been presented to the Parliament. The whole note is in these words, the suppressed part of which is designated by *Italics*. — "The undersigned, his Britannic Majesty's ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the French Republic, having transmitted to his Court the proposal which was made to him by the minister for foreign affairs on the 4th instant, *and that proposition having been judged impracticable in consequence of the refusal of His Majesty the Emperor of Russia to listen to it, and as falling, at the same time, short of the just pretensions of His Majesty*, (1) has just received orders to transmit to his excellency the accompanying project of a convention, founded on the only basis which His Majesty conceives, under the existing circumstances, to be susceptible of a definitive and amicable arrangement. The minister for foreign affairs will not fail to observe to what degree His Majesty has endeavoured to conciliate the security of his interests with the dignity of the First Consul. The undersigned flatters himself, that the First Consul, doing justice to these sentiments, will adopt in concert with His Majesty an expedient so suitable for restoring permanent tranquillity to both nations, and to all Europe.—The undersigned avails himself of this opportunity, to renew to his excellency the assurance of his highest consideration."—The passage, in Italics, which, as we have already observed, is not to be found in that copy of this note which was laid before the House of Commons, is very material indeed in forming an opinion of the real views of the negotiating parties; especially when considered in conjunction with the subsequent note of Talleyrand, which was dated on the 12th of May, and which will be found in page 856 of the supplementary sheet, attached to the one on which we are now writing. The principal ostensible object of the negotiation was, on our part, to render Malta *perfectly independent of France*. The proposition, which Talleyrand had made, on the 4th of May, for the purpose of effecting this object, was rejected by the British government; and, according to the above note of Lord Whitworth, one of the reasons why it was rejected, was, that it was judged impracticable, and it was judged impracticable, "*in consequence of the refusal of His Majesty the Emperor of Russia to accede to it.*" This refusal was, then, alleged, by our ministers, to be the obstacle to the *practicability* of Talleyrand's proposition; and this obstacle Talleyrand says, in his note of the 12th of May (which we beg the reader to peruse), does not exist, it having been removed *by the assurances just then given by the Emperor of Russia, through his ambassador at Paris*. The suppressed passage, therefore, must be considered as very material indeed, if to obtain for Malta real independence of France was the principal object, or a considerable object, of the negotiation. For our parts, we believe the war absolutely necessary for the preservation of our liberties and our lives, unless the evils of the treaty of Amiens could have been cured, unless the relative situation of England and France could have been totally changed, by negotiation; but, this is not the ground, on which the ministers have proceeded, and on which they now stand: Malta, the keeping of Malta out of the hands, and from under the influence, of France; this is the pivot on which the whole of their negotiation has turned; their objection to surrender that island has been the want of the guarantee of Russia, and, till towards the close of the,

(1) The words, in the Moniteur, are as follows:—"et cette proposition ayant été jugée impraticable, "par le refus de S. M. l'empereur de Russie de s'y "prêter, et, en même temps, au-dessous des justes "prétensions de Sa Majesté."

negotiation, it was their *only* objection. To remove this objection, Talleyrand makes, on the 4th of May, a proposition in the following words: "The First Consul is ready "to consent, that the island of Malta shall "be placed in the hands of one of the three "powers who have guaranteed its inde- "pendence, either Austria, Russia, or Prus- "sia, with a proviso, that, as soon as France "and England shall have come to an agree- "ment upon this article, they shall unite "in their requisitions to engage other pow- "ers, either contracting or acceding to the "treaty of Amiens, to consent to it."—To this proposition Lord Hawkesbury, in a letter to Lord Whitworth of the 7th of May, that, "if His Majesty could be dis- "posed to waive his demand for a tempo- "rary occupation of the island of Malta, "the Emperor of Russia would be the only "sovereign, to whom, in the present state "of Europe, he could consent that the "island should be assigned; and His Ma- "jes has certain and authentic information, "*that the Emperor of Russia would, on no account,* "*consent to garrison Malta.*"—Agreeably to this Lord Whitworth, on the 10th of May, delivered, to Talleyrand, the note which the French accuse our ministers of having garbled, in which note, according to the ministerial edition, his lordship makes not even an allusion to Russia, whereas, according to the French edition, he places at the very head of his objections *the refusal of Russia to accede to the proposition*, and in answer to this objection, Talleyrand's note of the 12th of May, (which was *kept back from the Parliament 'till after the debate on the papers)*, states, that assurances are just received at Paris *that Russia no longer persists in such refusal.* —What, then, are we to think of ministers leaving out of Lord Whitworth's note the passage relative to Russia, and of their keeping back, *'till after the debate*, Talleyrand's note of the 12th of May? If the fact does so appear; if the fact be so established, what are we to think of them, and what will the world think and say of our government and of our country? And, that such is the fact admits of very little doubt; indeed, it is evident from the papers themselves.—The True Briton and the Sun, which have lately published a gross fabrication, as being an authentic memorial of Talleyrand to Buonaparté, have the modesty to assert, that Talleyrand has fabricated the passage of Lord Whitworth's note, said to have been suppressed by the ministers. Talleyrand is very capable of a trick of this sort, if it could be played off with any hope of success; but, we do not rely upon the assertions of the honest Talleyrand; we take the internal evidence furnished by the papers laid before Parliament, and by those papers the shameful fact is completely established.—In the first place, the passage of Lord Whitworth's note, which we have given in *italics*, is not to be found in that note as laid before Parliament. This cannot be attributed to a *mistake* of the clerks, or the printers, because, unfortunately for the ministers, the French as well as the English, of this note, is inserted in the papers; and, no one will ever believe, that either clerks or printers, happened to omit, by mistake, exactly the same words in both French and English. That the note, in the parliamentary papers is such as the ministers intended it to be, is certain; and, that it is not such as it was delivered to Talleyrand appears, 1. from the statement of the French government, who must possess the original, and who, for their own sakes, would not have made an assertion so unequivocal, if they knew that Lord Whitworth had the power to contradict it. 2. Talleyrand in his note of the 12th, in reply to Lord Whitworth's of the 10th (which is the note in question) says; "moreover, the *assertion contained in his Ex-* "*cellancy's note of the 20th of this month*" (that is of Floreal, answering to the 10th of May), is expressed in the following terms: *by the refusal* "*of His Majesty the Emperor of Russia* "*to listen to it:*" but, in looking into Lord Whitworth's note of the tenth of May, as that note was presented to Parliament, we find no such assertion; and, if it had *not* been in the original note delivered to Talleyrand, Talleyrand could not have thus commented on it, which he did, observe, on the 12th of May, long before the papers were published in England, and while Lord Whitworth was yet at Paris. 3. Lord Whitworth, in his letter to Lord Hawkesbury of the 12th of May, describing the note which he delivered to Talleyrand on the 10th, says, that in this note, he stated, that, the proposition of the 4th "was considered "as on the one hand impracticable *from* "*the refusal of the Emperor of Russia to take* "*charge of Malta*, &c. &c." whereas, as we before observed, and as our readers will have seen, there is not, in this note, as presented to Parliament, even an allusion relative to Russia. Thus we have Lord Whitworth's own evidence as to the garbling of his note.—But, the French accuse our ministers of having suppressed *entirely* Talleyrand's note of the 12th of May, which was an answer to the garbled note; and, the London news-papers, with an unanimity and zeal worthy of a better cause, insist that the accusation is false, and invented for the purpose of vilifying this country. Softly, good gentlemen! You

say, the accusation *is false*, because Talleyrand's note of the 12th *was* laid before Parliament; but, *when* was it laid before Parliament? Not along with the other papers relative to the negotiation, but six days later, to wit, on the 24*th of May*, which, as it happens, is the very day, on which the French published their accusation. Therefore, their accusation was not false; for they could not know, on the 24th of May, that the note had, on that day, been presented to Parliament. Besides, good, honest, steady gentlemen, pray tell us *why* this note was not presented amongst the *first* parcel of papers. Was it of too late a date? Did it arive later than some of the others? No; for we find amongst the first papers that were presented, a note from Lord Whitworth to Talleyrand, *dated on the very same day that the note of Talleyrand was dated.* Lord Whitworth takes care to send forward this his note, by which he demanded his pasports, and which was the last, *the very last paper, that was written at Paris;* but, the important note of Talleyrand, which he had *previously* received, *he keeps in his pocket 'till he comes home, and then encloses it to Lord Hawkesbury in a letter, dated at London on the 20th of May!!!* Still, however, there was time to present it to Parliament previous to the debate on the papers, which was on the 23d of May; but it was not so presented, *'till after that debate was over;* for the presentation is *dated* on the 24th, and it was not actually slipped upon the table 'till some days later.—Thus is the charge, preferred by the French government, incontestibly established. How will the ministers, how can they do away this charge? Yet, if it be not done away, and effectually too, what nation will ever again place reliance on British faith? If one paper can be garbled by ministers, so may another paper; and, as far as relates to that part of the correspondence which is represented as having taken place between themselves and their agents, what reason have we to suppose, that *the whole* of it has not been new-moddled to suit "existing circumstances," or rather, have we not good reason to suppose that it has? For our own parts, if this matter be not satisfactorily cleared up, we shall not think ourselves bound to regard, as an admitted fact, any thing that they state, though accompanied with the most solemn asseverations; for, what can be more solemn, than a statement made to the legislature in the name of His Majesty?——Lord Whitworth, too, appears to be strangely implicated in this charge. As to the garbled note, he will, doubtless, easily prove, that he sent home a true copy of what he presented to Talleyrand; but, it does appear, at present, that the Note which he received from Talleyrand on the 12th of May, was not sent forward to government along with a Note, which he wrote *subsequent* to the receipt of Talleyrand's, and which subsequent Note was presented to Parliament amongst the papers first presented. Why was not this Note of Talleyrand's forwarded? Why was it kept back by his lordship till the 20th of May, till he himself arrived in London? Why was it not sent along with the Note which he wrote from Paris *after* the receipt of it, and which Note was sent time enough to find a place amongst the first papers? These are questions, which it behoves your lordship to answer without delay; the country has a right to demand this answer at his hands; and, if he witholds it, the conclusion will be by no means difficult to draw.

THE ARREST OF ENGLISH PEOPLE IN FRANCE seems to have excited a good deal of public indignation, in which we should most amply participate, if we did not recollect, that that same public applauded the infamous peace, which emboldened Buonaparté thus to trample on the public law of Europe. With regard to the illegality, therefore, the injustice and the cruelty, of this act, we can have very little to say. Let those complain, who wished and who expected to live in peace with Buonaparté; we had no such expectation, nor had we any such wish. Let those who hastened to crouch at the feet of the rebel and usurper, take the reward of their baseness; we are totally indifferent to their fate, and we should, most assuredly, object to their being exchanged against prisoners of war, prisoners captured at the expense of the nation, and at the risk of the lives of His Majesty's soldiers and sailors; no, these people have no such claim on their country, which, as far as their interest and convenience would permit them, they had abandoned, carrying with them their treasure and whatever further degree of support might be derived from their presence, their countenance, and their abilities. What! shall these base rich men, after having deserted their country, after having given the preference to France, after having carried away and squandered on our enemy the money raised by the labour of the husbandman, the artizan, and the manufacturer; shall they now, in the hour of their distress, call for the lives of those whom they have abandoned and insulted to be risked for their deliverance? They may call, but, we trust, they will call in vain. Let them *purchase* their ransom out of their own private property. The nation ought not to be taxed a penny for their release; and the minister who should pro-

pose to release them by such means, would, we trust, suffer the punishment due to so shameful and criminal an act.—We remember well, that, when *in profound peace*, Captain D'AUVERGNE was arrested, not a word of complaint was made by the public. The act was even justified in several of the public papers; or, it was, at least, so varnished over, so qualified, and apologized for, that it was made to appear to be a matter beneath the notice of government. "We, too, have an "alien act," said Lord Castlereagh! "It "is," said Lord Hawkesbury, "a mere mat-"ter of police!" Captain d'Auvergne went to France on very important business; he was a valuable officer in the King's service; no effort was made to obtain redress; none was obtained; and the *prudence* of ministers was applauded. And, shall our purses and our persons now be pressed into the service of the admiring crowd, who have been to pay their court to Buonaparté?—Nor can the particular case of MR. TALBOT be looked upon as an exception. The news-papers have called his imprisonment a violation of *the rights of Embassy*, forgetting, that, if they should make out this point, they will most assuredly establish the assertion of Buonaparté, who contends, that we have captured his people *previous to any declaration of war*. We say, and we say with truth, that the putting an end to the embassy at Paris, under the circumstances then existing, was, to all intents and purposes, a declaration of war; but, it would not be very consistent or very decent to complain of a violation of the rights of an embassy, the very putting an end to which we hold to be our justification for exercising the rights of war. Either, therefore, we must acknowledge Buonaparté's seizing of the Gallico-English to be founded on the established law of retaliation, or we must refrain from preferring against him the charge of violating the rights of embassy; either *all* the detained persons, except Mr. Talbot, are justly detained, or he is upon exactly the same footing with the rest. We know not, for our parts, what could induce Mr. Talbot to remain at Paris after the demise of the embassy; unless, like the spirit of a departed epicurean, he was still attracted to the scenes of his former enjoyment; and, if so, his detention can scarcely be regarded as a hardship.

THE MEDIATION OF RUSSIA, as moved for by Mr. Fox, and seconded by Mr. Pitt, on that happy, happy, happy day, the 27th ultimo, may very probably be obtained; for, it really appears, that the Emperor Alexander is fitting out a considerable *fleet of men of war*.—Read Swenska's Sketches!—But, how foolish, how ridiculously foolish will this nation look, in a few month's time, if it expects any thing from this mediation, except the further humiliation of England. Buonaparté and Alexander understand each other perfectly well; and, we may be assured, that if Russia has prepared a fleet, it is only *to give efficacy to that admirable convention*, which was Lord Hawkesbury's *coup d'essai* in the diplomatic career, and by which we virtually gave up one of the most important maritime rights that we ever possessed. Russia must, too, be excellently disposed to mediate a peace advantageous for us after the trick which our ministers have played, in order to prevent her from setting foot in Malta, a post which, above all others in the world she was desirous to occupy, and which the Consul artfully proposed to give her possession of. This must most sweetly dispose her for acts of amity towards us! Yet, there are not wanting politicians to entertain very sanguine hopes from this mediation, notwithstanding it is evidently the policy, as it is, indeed, the interest of Russia (if gratifying her ambition be interest) to side with France against England, and to lower the maritime power and pride of the latter by every possible means, particularly while she holds Malta, the very place to obtain which in perpetuity we are asking, begging, beseeching this monstrous mediation! It is a maxim, and long has been a maxim with the Richmond Park Ministry, that "no good was to be expected from Russia, "*while* COUNT MARKOFF *remained in* "*Paris*." The Count is still at Paris; and, what is more, he is to be the channel of the mediation, if the ridiculous proposition should really be acted upon.—Mr. Fox must have made the motion, to which we have alluded, without any hope of its being adopted. What, then, must have been his surprize to see all his notions as well as his mischievous motion, adopted by Mr. Pitt? We were surprized to see Mr. Windham and Mr. Grenville silent on this occasion. Approve of the motion they could not, we are certain; and, though it was not put to the vote, though that was prevented by the ministers *promising to adopt the measure which it recommended*, still, we think, that Mr. Windham should have taken an opportunity of giving to the whole proceeding some strong mark of his disapprobation. All the sound part of the nation look to him, at this momentous crisis, for the reasons whereon to form their opinions, both of men and of measures. Since the signing of the fatal preliminaries, since the sun of England sunk beneath the genius of France, since our political horizon has been enveloped in darkness, and the vessel of state committed to an ignorant, a low minded and

cowardly crew, he has been our polar star, shining while other lights hid their head, always in his place and always luminous; constantly forewarning us of our dangers, and constantly pointing to the cause of safety and of honour. From him, therefore, on every important occasion, we must naturally wish to hear something; and, particularly when, by, his keeping silence, a destructive measure may go forth with the appearance of having his consent.

CHANGE IN THE MINISTRY.—Mr. Tierney; we beg his pardon, "the *Right Ho-* "*nourable* Mr. Tierney" (we do not know his Christian name); the famous Mr. Tierney, who so long made a conspicuous figure in the poems and caricatures of the friends of Mr. Pitt, has, after a long and arduous struggle, made a safe lodgment upon the ministerial bench, in character of Treasurer of the Navy, a place of four thousand a year. Mr. Bragge, the predecessor of Mr. Tierney, is, it seems to be Chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster, in place of Lord Liverpool, who with a disinterestedness and patriotism peculiar to well-meaning men and "*safe* politicians," has thus, at the age of four-score, given up four thousand out of about seven thousand a year, which he has enjoyed from before the far greater part of us were born, and which he now partly relinquishes with the hope of keeping together an administration, on the existence of which depend upwards of thirty thousand a year, received by his son and other of his relations. It is, we suppose, in emulation of this venerable and noble "col- "lector of the customs inwards," that Mr. Bragge has yielded a place of four thousand a year, held during pleasure, for a place of the same value, held during life.—It is said, that further changes are to take place; and, if such can take place, without any diminution of the emoluments of the The Family, we should think they would; for some sort of change is absolutely necessary to keep even the meanest of the people quiet.—Mr. Tierney is said to have been admitted for the sake of his talents in finance; and, if public rumour does not deceive us, he has conceived some plan, which he imagines will, in future, *render loans unnecessary*. On the first point we must observe, that the fact, if true, seems to contradict that high opinion, which the wiseacres had formed of Mr. Addington's financial abilities. With respect to the second point, we are rather inclined to doubt the fact; but, if it be true, if Mr. Tierney has conceived such a plan, and if he really does provide for the exigencies of the state, without the aid of loans, we hesitate not to pronounce him a conjuror far surpassing Dr. Val. Mr. Tierney's father was, if we mistake not, something in the treasuring and financiering way, and even for the navy, and, therefore, like his worthy, his truly worthy colleague, Lord Hawkesbury, he may, probably, possess "an "hereditary disposition to office;" but, conjuring, it is well known, does not go by descent, and, therefore, though we have no reason to suppose, that Mr. Tierney is, in any one point, inferior to his worthy ancestors, and though that ancestor should himself have been a conjuror, it does not follow, that Mr. Tierney will prove a conjuror too; and, we repeat, that nothing short of conjuring, nothing short of the down-right black art, will enable him, without loans, to carry on the war, or even to keep up the peace establishment last fixed on. The national expenditure of this present year will be about £54,000,000, and the revenue will be about £30,000,000; so that, if there be any truth in figures, there will be a deficit of about £24,000,000 to be raised by *new taxes*. That this sum never can be raised from the people Mr. Tierney must be very well assured, and therefore, he must intend to proceed by conjuration, in which it is unnecessary for us to say, that we most heartily wish him success.——But, in the expenditure of the year, we have included the charges on account of the National Debt and the Sinking Fund, which amount to about twenty-four out of the fifty-four millions; so that, if Mr. Tierney means *not to pay these charges*, or to *tax the funds*, which is nearly the same thing, he may possibly effect his object without the aid of supernatural faculties. At any rate, we hope, that, in the prosecution of his plan, he will endeavour to spare the inhabitants of the Borough, to whom, like another Mayor of Garrat, he has, for many years past, been constantly pledging his honour to bring about an alleviation of their burdens.—— Farcical, however, as all this is in the eyes of other people, Mr. Tierney's promotion can be no farce with Mr. Pitt, towards whom that promotion is, on the part of Mr. Addington, a guage of defiance, if not a stupid mark of contempt, and, on the part of Mr. Tierney, a signal of triumph. This is the man, and the only man, who, for several years past, has set himself, foot to foot, against Mr. Pitt; who has constantly opposed his principles, his measures, and his system, particularly his favourite system of finance, that great foundation of his fame, that pedestal without the durability of which his statue must sink into the earth. Disguise the thing, therefore, in whatever manner he pleases, Mr. Pitt must feel, that he has, at last, been over-reached, out-witted, and

defeated; for, it is absolutely impossible, that he should not be cut to the very soul at seeing Mr. Tierney the dictator on that Bench, from which he so long looked down on Mr. Tierney with contempt. Mr. Pitt *must* entertain these feelings, and the attempt to hide them, by giving the ministers his support, will only discover a conscious weakness, a conscious inability to oppose them with success. He perceives clearly enough the defection of his former adherents, who are daily becoming less and less numerous, less and less warm, and who, though they still profess their admiration of his character and talents, will give their support to his enemy, in which support, to avoid the mortification of being left in a minority, and of seeing his fall recorded by a vote of that Parliament, over which he so long has ruled, he himself will join. Those persons, who, having nothing within themselves whereby to obtain a name or attract notice, still endeavour to get rid of their insignificance by calling themselves Pittites, affect to live in hopes, and perhaps really do live in hopes, of seeing their leader restored to his former power and splendor. This is possible; but, nothing that we find in history, nothing that we can collect from the circumstances of the present times, authorizes us to regard it as probable. Public opinion is a stream, which, if it once changes a long continued course, seldom or never returns to its ancient bed. Had Mr. Pitt, when he retired from his Majesty's service, left his place to be supplied without any interference of his own; had he regularly continued his attendance in Parliament, speaking and voting merely as a member of that body, supporting those measures that were good, and opposing those that were bad; had he left the war to be continued, or the peace to be made, by the ministers themselves; and, had he, when the peace of Amiens came to be discussed, given it that mark of reprobation, which it has been found to merit; had this been his line of conduct, his return to power would, at this day, have been the undivided wish of the nation, who would have looked to him as an immoveable rock of defence. But, he, unhappily for his country and for his own fame, chose a course entirely different. The new cabinet was moulded up by his assistance, and with every appearance of wishing to retain his power after he had yielded his place, not unaccompanied with some marks of having retired himself for the purpose of getting rid of his colleagues, and with a view of returning to exercise absolute sway amongst others of his own creation. The moment, too, that he ceased to be minister, he seemed to have forgotten that he was a member of parliament; and, as if it were beneath him to be any thing less than the ruler of the nation, he imitated the example of secession which had been given him by his rival orator. In the mean time, however, by whispers and nods, his followers were instructed to support the ministers, lest they should sink under their opponents, lest a breach should be made, and lest the cabinet should fall into the hands of others whom he hated, or, which was nearly the same thing, over whom he could not hope to have an absolute controul. From this motive it was, that he supported the Preliminary and Definitive Treaties; for, it is utterly incredible that he should not have seen their destructive tendency; and, having supported them, having pledged himself to that support in the most unequivocal manner, he could not now avail himself of that opposition, which might yet have restored him to power. Therefore, it is that we see his simple followers, fed by vain hopes of a future opportunity, lending their aid to preserve his consistency and to disguise his mortification. His friends, indeed, do say that he means to join in the vote of censure, this night (Friday, 3d of June,) to be brought forward. We shall rejoice to see this assertion verified, and we are sorry, that the nature of our publication does not permit us to wait the event, before this sheet is put to the press; but, these are our opinions, and though we shall be glad to see cause for retracting them, we regard it as a duty to submit them to our readers.—In the mean time, the proceedings in the House of Lords strongly corroborate all that we have said. On the 2d instant, Earl Fitzwilliam brought forward *certain resolutions*, disapproving of the conduct of ministers, on which the *previous question* was moved by Lord Grosvenor, after which the middle course of *adjournment* was moved by Lord Mulgrave and supported by Lord Melville; and, the result was, that the adjournment was *negatived*, 106 to 18, the previous question was *carried*, 110 to 15, and the resolutions negatived without a division; so that, in approbation of their conduct, the ministers had a majority of 95 out of 125.

POSTSCRIPT, *Friday noon.*

We have just heard that MR. SUETT, of Drury Lane Theatre, is about to be appointed Secretary at War!!!!!

Printed by Cox and Baylis, No. 75, Great Queen Street, and published by R. Bagshaw, Bow Street, Covent Garden, where former Numbers may be had; sold also by E. Harding, No. 18, Pall-Mall.

TO THE PUBLIC.

At this time when the eyes of all the civilized world are directed to Egypt and Malta, the possession and retention of which countries by France and England have produced such important effects, and been attended with so considerable an expense of blood and treasure, when Great-Britain has become so interested in their fate as to engage exclusively on their account in a war with France, after the short interval of a few months of peace; it will not be considered as ill-timed or uninteresting by an intelligent Public to inquire more minutely what has been done heretofore, into the very extraordinary circumstance of their being allowed to fall a prey to our enemy, at a time when our navy had attained a height of improvement and pre-eminence in strength and skill unexampled in our history, and when the marine of our enemies was sunk to the lowest ebb of insignificance approaching annihilation.

The importance to this country of the occupation of these places by the French, was as well understood by us at the time the expedition was preparing for Egypt at Toulon, as it is at this moment; yet strange and unaccountable to relate, the French were knowingly and uninterruptedly permitted to collect their force for this enterprize eight or ten months previous to its sailing, and to draw vessels, troops, and stores with the same security as if in time of peace, from every port in the Mediterranean, without which foreign aid nothing of importance could have been undertaken from that port.

Before we proceed to examine the past conduct of the Marine Minister in this singular and eventful business, let us take a view of the force under Lord St. Vincent, who then commanded on the Mediterranean station, and of the means his lordship possessed to counteract and defeat the designs of the enemy, whose force and position may be also described.

From the latter end of the year 1787, when the French began to collect a force at Toulon, until the latter end of May, when their expedition sailed for Malta, our Mediterranean fleet consisted of about 24 sail of the line, (of which none carried less than 74 guns) some ships of 50 and 44 guns on two decks, with a very large proportion of frigates and smaller vessels; and during a portion of this time, Lord St. Vincent had at his disposal, a squadron of five or six Portuguese ships of the line, with some frigates of that nation. The only two very material objects for his lordship's attention within the limits of his command, were the Spanish fleet in Cadiz, and the French force collecting at Toulon; the former consisted of 20 or 21 sail of the line in some sort of preparation for sea, but with few men on board, (part of the fleet of 27 sail of the line his lordship had beaten off Cape St. Vincent with his squadron of 14 sail) together with seven or eight others unrigged, or in a state of ordinary, and several frigates. The latter varied from three or four ill provided ships of the line with two or three frigates of the first, until it was augmented in the end to 12 or 13 ships of the line and four or five frigates with near 400 transports. The Spanish fleet, which had been most insulting and effectually blockaded in Cadiz during a great part of this time by eight or nine sail of the British line, were known to be in a miserable state of unfitness for active service; and officers and men but very little zealous in the cause they appeared compelled to support; and it was clear the French force at Toulon could only attach a degree of strength and importance, and early arrive at a fitness for service, by being totally unmolested and left at full *liberty* to receive external supplies.

The disposition during this time of Lord St. Vincent's fleet was in general as follows; about half the ships of the line, sometimes more, with a very small proportion of frigates and other vessels were stationed off Cadiz; two ships of the line were kept almost constantly cruizing off Cape St. Vincent, and, at the same time, two others were sent off Madeira to look for prizes; of the remainder of the ships of the line, some of them at Gibraltar, others at the Tagus; some of the frigates were kept off Cape Finisterre, others off Corunna, and some along the Coast of Portugal. No part of the fleet was stationed to the eastward of Gibraltar, except a fifty gun ship with a frigate, and one or two sloops, which had latterly been sent up the Mediterranean, but not particularly to cruize off the Port of Toulon. Insignificant as this last mentioned little squadron was, had it been exclusively employed, *at an early period*, to interrupt the communication with Toulon, it might have been of material service; but it was kept cruizing for other purposes, in the Mediterranean generally, and returned to Gibraltar about a fortnight before the sailing of the Toulon fleet; the moment of all others, when it ought to have been left there, if only to lay on the skirts of the convoy to ascertain its route. Instead of this disposition, had the four or five ships of the line generally employed to look after

prizes, been detached with a fifty gun ship and three or four frigates, about two or three months before the sailing of the enemy from Toulon, with orders to retard the equipment of the expedition forming in that port by every possible means, such as intercepting their supplies, &c. the sailing of the expedition must have been considerably delayed, and certainly until a junction might have been formed between this squadron and a reinforcement of seven or eight sail of the line sent from England, which reached Toulon about ten days or a fortnight after the sailing of the French fleet; when its departure must have been effectually put a stop to.

That Lord St. Vincent seems in duty bound to have done this at least, must, I conceive, appear evident to every one acquainted with the strength of the fleet at his lordship's disposal; with the wretched state of the Spanish ships in Cadiz; and with the serious consequences that might attend the successful issue of the French enterprize.

That his lordship might have done more, that he might have detached from his fleet a force sufficient to have stopped the French expedition had it been encountered in *full* force, and yet left ships enough off Cadiz to keep the Spaniard in check, I could venture to assert and prove. Ten sail of the line of *British* ships only were frequently absent at one time from the blockade of Cadiz, even when Lord St. Vincent commanded it in person; though never of so material a service as this would have been, which indeed, it might be said, had become the first object for his lordship's attention.

Had his lordship, however, done what is mentioned in the first instance, neither Malta or Egypt would ever have been in the possession of the French!!!

What an expense of blood and treasure would the adoption of either of these measures have saved! What a difference in the actual state of this country might they have produced!—Why neither of them were resorted to, why the French were entirely left to themselves until too late to be interrupted effectually, remains to be explained, as certainly it ought, and that without delay.

It will not be pretended, after what has been already said, that four or five sail of the British line with a fifty and frigates was too small a force to be risked off Toulon; nor will it be said, that our not having a port in the Mediterranean was a sufficient reason for our not sending ships there. Lord Nelson, who had just joined Lord St. Vincent with one ship of the line, was detached with only three, a fifty gun ship and about four smaller vessels on that service, (though too late) when the enemy were known to be in their *greatest force*. His lordship's ship was dismantled; he got shelter to repair in Sardinia, and in Sicily he procured water and provisions. In the worst case, they might have had supplies sent them from Gibraltar.

Neither will it be held by professional men, that an English squadron of ten or eleven sail of the line would have been unequal at that period, to stop the progress of twelve or thirteen defective French line of battle ships, ill manned and equiped, crowded with troops, and charged with a convoy of near 400 sail of ill provided vessels, some of them with hardly a second sail to bend. Indeed the recent achievement of Sir James Saumarez in the Gut of Gibraltar is fresh in the memory of every one.

With respect to the part which the board of Admiralty had in this transaction, it certainly might have sent a reinforcement to Lord St. Vincent at an earlier period than it did, considering the importance of certainly and effectually counteracting the designs of the enemy in the Mediterranean. The defeat of the Dutch fleet, and the capture of several of their large ships by Lord Duncan in the preceding October, had considerably increased our disposeable force, and many ships of the line were suffered to remain uncommissioned in our ports, which might have been added to our fleet in the Mediterranean.

Of such importance was it to foil this last and greatest of the French expeditions during the late war; so long in preparing, so formidable in its nature, and so apparently vast in its design, that no effort should have been left untried by the minister or his admiral to effect it.

Our letting the French escape on their expedition to Bantry Bay, and from Brest to the Mediterranean and back again, were bad samples of our naval exertion; but the allowing Buonaparté with his immense and ill appointed armada, to reach Egypt without interruption, after capturing the hitherto considered impregnable fortress of La Valetta and the Island of Malta, in defiance of our navy, then omnipotent, was worse than all; nothing, in short, appeared wanting to crown the triumph of the French and to complete the disgrace of our then omnipotent or rather of its rulers, but the safe return of the French fleet to Toulon; a circumstance, which had Admiral Brueix been allowed to act as he proposed, would cer-

tainly have taken place about the time Lord Nelson reached the coast of Egypt the second time.

THE NAVY.

Sir,—I cannot suffer the *miserable* attempt which was yesterday made to justify the proceedings of the Board of Admiralty by that *hireling* and contemptible *time-serving* paper called the "*Times*," to go abroad to the public without making some observations thereon.—I shall therefore, state my ideas in support of your correspondent L. M., and I most solemnly declare, that I will not advance one observation that I could not justify before any tribunal whatever.—Sir, in the first place, the *sapient* partizans of the present Admiralty attach the *credit* to Earl Spencer for his recommendation with regard to the arrangement of shipwrights' apprentices; although I cannot entirely approve of his plan, still I condemn ten times, nay, an hundred times more, the mode which our present *wise rulers* have adopted. Sir, their plan (as was observed in your Register on Saturday last) is pregnant with the most destructive consequences, it is considered by every person, from the highest to the lowest of the trade, as an extremely unwise measure, a measure which if pursued, will ultimately ruin a profession, upon the prosperity of which, our very existence as a nation depends. Even those very men to whom servants have been given, so far from being grateful, for that which the Admiralty conceive an *encouragement* and *reward* for *past services*, are (I have every reason to believe) equally dissatisfied. —The boys that are now brought into the service are of the lowest education, or more properly speaking of no education at all, and therefore, cannot possibly, nor will they ever have an idea beyond the laborious part. The instructors of them (for by that appellation the people are known who receive *two-thirds* of their wages) have likewise lost all *their* zeal to teach them the common duties of their trade, and it now appears a matter of perfect indifference to both, the one whether he shall take any trouble to instruct, and the other to learn. And, now Sir, let us enquire who were the *wise* projectors of such a *wise* plan. It certainly could not have originated with the surveyors of the navy, that is impossible! for they have not been more than *forty or fifty* years in the service, and therefore *they cannot* be supposed capable of giving an opinion after so *little* experience!!! No Sir, it first secured to men who have been to sea nearly the whole of their lives, (and who by the bye have evinced, in many instances, a very contracted idea of the duties of the civil department,) I mean the *triumvirate* at the Admiralty, and the *segacious* Mr. *Commissioner* Tucker, these are the men who possess such *wonderful* knowledge, and who are so capable of *benefitting* the country, by revolutionizing the civil department of the navy, these are the men who are so *immaculate* as to be above all advice!! And therefore the surveyors were put on the shelf, as mere non-entities. And in order to save the nation a few pounds a year by putting a stop to the *frauds* (as they are pleased to express themselves, and which are magnified to an extent beyond any thing that ever existed,) they will strike the very vitals of a profession of the utmost importance.—It is likewise with confidence asserted, by the tools of Lord St. Vincent, that the Dock Yards are full of stores, and further state, that had there been any wants, it must have been the fault of the Navy Board, and not the Admiralty, as the keeping up the compliment of stores particularly relate to them.

A most *impudent* falsehood, for I positively affirm, that with regard to the article of timber the utmost scarcity prevails, excepting in Chatham yard, where I believe there is more timber than in all the other yards put together. So far from any blame being attached to the Navy Board, I am persuaded that had they have been left to themselves, the many, very many grievances now complained of would never have existed. But Sir, the Navy Board have long since lost *their* authority, in the opinion of the Admiralty they are now mere cyphers, and into such a degraded state have they fallen, that they dare not venture to give an order however trivial, without consulting their *unrelenting* superiors; and if they should presume to offer their advice, it is ten to one but that they are *insulted:* so much for the Navy Board, a board that was once considered of the first importance, a board whom former Admiralties have *deigned* to consult: and Sir, it is with pain I must state my belief, that if the present Admiralty retain their situation, they will continue to fall, till at last the name of the Navy Board will no longer be known. Unless it should happen that either *Sir Thomas Troubridge* or *Captain Markham* should succeed to the comptrollership, then what a mighty change will take place, then will they once more shine forth in all their splendour, then will they regain their wonted consequence ——With regard to the ship carpenters being employed in the Dock yards, I am thoroughly persuaded that no consideration would have induced the Admiralty to have resorted to *their* services,

had they not have been absolutely wanted in consequence of the deficiency of shipwrights; and therefore they wisely make a *merit* of *necessity*.—It is said, that not a shipwright who was capable of working was discharged at the visitation of the Admiralty, this Sir, I believe is very true, for the yards in general were then likewise very considerably short of the intended *peace* establishment, the discharges which your correspondent alludes to, were those which took place in May 1801, as observed in page 129 in the 5th No of the 3d Volume of your Register.—But Sir, the circumstance of the *Victory* seems to be their rallying point, on her it appears they have placed all their hopes of refutation, and in the delirium of their joy, they call you a *base calumniator*, and an *utterer of falsehoods*, and in order to make your assertion appear more glaring they further assure the public that *no exertion* was made use of beyond *what* was given to other ships. Never was there a more infamous falsehood advanced, for I have every reason to suppose, (and I solemnly declare my firm conviction of the truth of my information,) that the Victory had every preference which could possibly be given to her, that the most pressing orders were sent to hasten her equipment, and can there be a stronger proof of it, than their keeping ships in commission an unusual length of time in order that their crews might be employed on board her, and likewise, from their taking the *pensioners* from the *blocks* and *bulks*, as observed by your correspondent L. M.; could they Sir, evince a more striking proof of their anxiety to get her to sea? Most indubitably not. But notwithstanding all their exertions she would still have been in Long Reach, had she not have been nearly manned, owing to an unforeseen *accident*, (unforeseen by our present *wise* rulers at the Admiralty,) by her receiving the crew of the *Utrecht* of 64 guns, one of the ships fitted *since* the King's message of the 8th March, and since *unfitted* for sea by a gale of wind, in consequence of the defective state in which she was sent out, to fulfil the boasted vaunt of our *well informed* minister; who "*would rather risk* "*the imputation of having uttered unguarded* "*language than have any improper insinuation,* "*thrown out against the present board of* "*Admiralty!!!*"——And now Sir, having taken a view of every part that was advanced by those *zealous partizans* of the *illustrious triumvirate* at the Admiralty, I will only ask them their reasons why, when they took up their pens, they did not attempt to refute the assertions that were adduced by your correspondent; I allude to those which relate to the men being obliged to sleep night after night on the decks without *beds* and *blankets*, although the Dock Yards, (as they are *pleased* to say,) are *full* of stores of every description; and to the circumstance of the strange contradictory proceedings with regard to the Unicorn frigate, and to their recinding their own *well digested* orders? No, Sir, they wisely thought that the least said on those subjects the better, and therefore they prudently remained silent.—Nor did they advance ever one solitary assertion in support of the arguments of their *friend* and *patron*, Captain Markham, who within the walls of St. Stephen's Chapel proclaimed the French navy, *fishing boats*, and who *modestly* attributed the force we have now abroad, to the *prudent* and extremely *wise* exertions of himself and *colleagues*.—I will conclude by advising those *base hirelings*, who dare to call your publication a *catalogue of lies*, to be in future less forward in their fulsome panegyrics, and never again attempt to vindicate the conduct of a set of men, whose measures have been and will continue to be *unwise* and *inconsistent* in the extreme; for in their attempt to justify, they only expose, and, by every effort to extricate themselves, only get deeper and deeper in the mire.——Yours, &c.

7th May, 1803. VERITAS.

PUBLIC PAPERS.

DECLARATION *of France, relative to the rupture with England, communicated on the 14th of May, 1803, to the Conservative Senate of the French Republic.*

The Counsellors of State, Bigot Prememeau, Desolles and Fleurieu, made a communication to the Senate of the note addressed, on the 13th, to the Ambassador of his Britannic Majesty by the Minister of the Foreign Department.

In the important and serious situations in which the two nations are involved, the undersigned Minister for the Foreign Department of the French Republic has orders to deliver to the British Government the following note:

On the 17th Ventôse (March 8), his Britannic Majesty made a communication to Parliament by a special message, that formidable armaments were preparing in the ports of France and Holland; and that important discussions, of an uncertain event, divided the two governments.

That unexpected and extraordinary declaration excited general astonishment. The maritime situation of France was open. All Europe knew that there was no formidable armament either in the ports of France or of Holland.

The undersigned need not to recall to his Excellency Lord Whitworth's remembrance what was said at that time. The source of such intelligence was inexplicable, as it was without any foundation. The personal discernment of Lord Whitworth, and the loyalty of his character, are not for a moment to be suspected.

The assertion that France was making hostile armaments was a manifest supposition, and could not deceive any person. Its natural effect was to induce an opinion that it was only the means sought after by men remarkable for their love of disturbance, and who sought with avidity a pretext for exciting trouble, and inflaming the passions of the British people, to create jealousy, hatred and alarm.

As to the English government, though it might by false reports be led into error with regard to the existence of armaments, it could not be so with regard to the existence of negotiations.

The Ambassador of the Republic at London was no sooner informed of the message of his Britannic Majesty, than astonished at hearing of negotiations of which he had not any knowledge, he went to Lord Hawkesbury, suspecting that an appeal to arms, founded upon false suppositions, might be a cover for the project of violating the Treaty of Amiens, with regard to the clauses not yet executed; and presented on the 19th Ventôse (Feb. 20), a note demanding an explanation.

At the same time, the undersigned had orders to ask of his Excellency Lord Whitworth, what motives could determine his government to use in the message two assertions, both equally false, in order to arm the nation, and break its connexion with France.

His Excellency Lord Hawkesbury returned on the 24th Ventôse (March 15,) a vague, aggressive, and positive note: that note, far from clearing up any point, involved the matters in discussion in greater obscurity.—It left little means of opening discussion, and still less of bringing it to a happy termination.

The answer of the French Government of the 8th Germinal (March 29,) was as moderate and pacific as that of the British Government had been hostile.

The First Consul declared, that he would not accept the warlike challenge of England: that he would avoid weighing the expressions in that hostile sense in which they might be taken; and that, in short, he would not believe that his Britannic Majesty would violate the sacredness of a treaty, on which the safety of all nations depends. That declaration, made by order of the First Consul, brought forth a new note of 17th Germinal (April 7), in which the French Government was surprised to find an indeterminate demand of satisfactions addressed to it.—The vague manner of that demand, made without motive and without object, only shewed the impropriety of its meaning.

The intention, evident from that note, was the violation of the Treaty of Amiens, by refusing to evacuate Malta. They seemed to be flattered with the hope that the French people would consent to give satisfaction, for two supposed facts, on the alleging of which they had perhaps themselves a right to demand satisfaction.

In transmitting that communication, Lord Whitworth demanded, that an arrangement should be immediately made upon the basis already explained; and he even insinuated, that in case that was not done, he was afraid he should have orders from his government very soon to leave France, and put an end to his embassy.

What could the government of the Republic answer to such rude and strange overtures? Nothing but a great love of peace could subdue indignation.

To determine upon a calm and cool decision, which might give time for reason and justice to subdue passion, it was necessary to be deeply impressed with the idea that the numerous victims of the quarrels between governments have no share in those insults which create their anger; that the thousands of brave citizens, who, through devotion to the cause of their country, shed their blood, have no desire to offend a neighbouring and powerful people; and that they have no interest in the proud and vain pretensions of supremacy. It is not only necessary to be impressed with these ideas, but to be entirely governed by them.

His Excellency, Lord Whitworth, consented to write to his Court, that the First Consul would not agree to the violation of a solemn treaty, but that he wished for peace, and that if the English government desired a convention, in order to settle the arrangements which were not included in the Treaty of Amiens, he would not object to it; and that the object of that convention would be to redress reciprocal grievances.

These intentions were moderate and just. It would have been difficult to propose a negotiation on a more liberal ground. It is not foreign to the purpose here to observe, that it was six weeks after the message in which a negotiation of a serious na-

ture had been announced: and that the ministers of the two governments had not yet been able to begin a real negotiation.

Lord Whitworth received fresh orders; he presented successively two projets of convention.

By the 1st it was proposed, that Malta should remain under the dominion of the King of England; and that clause agreed to, his Britannic Majesty offered to acknowledge all that had been done in Europe posterior to the Treaty of Amiens.

The King of England promised, besides, to take measures, so that those men, who in different parts of England laid plots against France, should be effectually suppressed.

The undersigned had the honour of observing to his Excellency, Lord Whitworth, that the first projet of convention was a palpable violation of the Treaty of Amiens, and overturned the basis of the negotiation which his Excellency had undertaken to present to his Court. That, as to the acknowledgment offered by his Majesty, there were no objects to which the wish of his Britannic Majesty to obtain the possession of it, the First Consul had no right to express in the consent or refusal.

That the independence of the Order and Island of Malta was the result of a special article of the Treaty of Amiens, and that therefore the First Consul cannot take any new determination on the subject, without consulting the other contracting parties, the King of Spain, and the Batavian Republic. That the independence of the Island of Malta had been guaranteed by his Majesty, the Emperor of Germany, and that the ratifications of that guarantee were exchanged; that their Majesties the Emperor of Russia and the King of Prussia, had guaranteed the independence of the Order and of the Island of Malta; that their guarantees had been demanded by England as well as France; that it was the duty of the First Consul to accept them, and that he had accepted them; that the First Consul could not listen to any proposal with respect to the independence of the Order and Island of Malta, without first knowing the intentions of the governments which had guaranteed it.

That a small corps of French troops were at the time of the message stationed in Holland, in virtue of a convention between that Republic and France, and that the First Consul had not hesitated to say that he should evacuate Holland as soon as the stipulations of the Treaty of Amiens had been carried into effect by England.

To this note, which from its stile and the precision of the motives alleged, breathed only equity, peace, and moderation, Lord Whitworth replied, by a peremptory demand of passports, and in giving the information that he expected to use them on Wednesday, the 4th of May, at 5 o'clock in the morning.

The French Government deeply felt the contrast between a determination so absolute, and that character of urbanity, justice, and conciliation, which in all circumstances, but particularly in the last which occurred, it had endeavoured to display. Nevertheless, it thought a sacrifice was due to the interest of humanity. It would not abandon all hopes of peace till the last moment, and the undersigned delivered a new note to Lord Whitworth, by which France offered to consent that Malta should be given up to the protection of any of those guaranteeing powers, Austria, Russia, or Prussia.

This proposal appeared to Lord Whitworth himself, as if it ought to satisfy the pretensions of the court; he suspended his departure, and took the note for the purpose of referring it to his Court.

In the mean-time the Ambassador of the Republic at London, informed of the demand that Lord Whitworth had made of passports to return to England, received orders to hold himself in readiness for his departure. He consequently demanded his passports, which were immediately granted him. This mezzotermine proposed by the French was far from the Treaty of Amiens; but it had the double advantage of coming as near as possible to its spirit, that is to say, to make Malta independent of both nations, and at the same time offering that guarantee which was so much called for, and which the British ministers pretended to be the only object of their alarms.

The British government understood the force of these reasons, and the unhappy fatality which leads it now into war, afforded it no reply but a false assertion.

The 21st of this month Lord Whitworth delivered a note, in which he stated that Russia had refused what had been demanded of her.

There were three guaranteeing powers, and if Russia had refused her guarantee, still there remained the Emperor of Germany and the King of Prussia. But how could Russia have signified its intentions on a new proposition which had been suggested only a few days? It was in the knowledge of England, that Russia and Prussia had promised to guarantee the independence of Malta with some slight modifications, and

that the French government were anxious to accept the guarantee, and from the consistency and fidelity to his engagement, which characterises the Emperor Alexander, there was no doubt but he would accept the proposition which was submitted to him: but Providence, which is sometimes pleased to confound bad faith, caused to arrive at the same hour, at the same instant, even when Lord Whitworth delivered his note, a Courier from Russia, addressed to the plenipotentiaries of that power at Paris and at London, by which his Majesty the Emperor of Russia manifested with particular energy the pain that he had felt at hearing the resolution of his Britannic Majesty to keep Malta. He renewed the assurances of his guarantee, and declared, that he accepted the demand made of his mediation by the First Consul, if both the powers would accede to it. The undersigned without delay informed Lord Whitworth, by a note, of the error into which his Court had fallen, not doubting that since that was the only objection which had been presented, that as soon as that Court should be informed of the reiterated and positive assurances of Russia, she would readily deliver Malta to one of the three guaranteeing powers. What, then, must have been the astonishment of the undersigned, when Lord Whitworth, instead of entering into any explanation, or without endeavouring either to contradict or discuss the declarations which the undersigned has made him, has informed him by a note of the same day, that by the tenor of his instructions, he was ordered to depart thirty-six hours after the delivery of his last note, and has renewed his demand for passports! The undersigned therefore forwarded them to him immediately.

Could the English Ambassador have behaved himself differently if the French government had been besieged in a town incable of defence, and that the question was not about the most important interests which the British cabinet has treated of for more than 300 years, but about a simple capitulation.

The opening of the negotiations has been preceded by armaments announced with great parade. Every day, every hour, the commencement of hostilities has been expected; and what is this *ultimatum* which is presented to the French government to be signed in 24 hours?—It must consent to give up an Island which does not belong to it; it must violate, itself, to its own disadvantage, a solemn treaty, under the pretence that England wants some new security against her; it must give up all the respect due to the other contracting parties, in destroying, without their consent, an article of the treaty, which, for their sake, had occupied a considerable time in the conferences of peace. It must also be wanting in respect for the guaranteeing powers, in consenting that an Island which they have wished to be independent, shall remain ten years under the authority of the British Crown. That it is to take from the Order of Malta the sovereignty of that state which has been restored to it, and that this sovereignty is to be transmitted to the inhabitants: that by this spoliation it is to offend all the powers which have acknowledged the re-establishment of the Order, which have guaranteed it, and which, in the arrangement of Germany, have secured its indemnities for the losses which it has experienced.

Such is the substance of this *ultimatum*, which presents a series of pretensions always increasing, in proportion to the moderation which the government of the Republic has shewn. At first England consented to the preservation of the Order of Malta, and only wished to subject the Order and its possessions to the British authority.—To day, and for the first time, she demands the abolition of the Order, and that this must be agreed to in thirty-six hours.

But as to the conditions proposed, were they as agreeable to the Treaty of Amiens and the interest of France as they are contrary to them, the form of the demand, the term of 36 hours prescribed for the answer, must decide the determination of the French government. No, never will France acknowledge in any government the right of annulling, by a single act of its pleasure, the stipulations of a reciprocal engagement. If it has even permitted that in a form somewhat menacing an *ultimatum* of seven days to be considered, if it has received another *ultimatum* with a term of 36 hours annexed to it, and treaties presented in a conclusive form which were never negotiated, it could have no other object than to give the British government an example of moderation, but it can consent to nothing that compromises its dignity or its power.

The undersigned is then charged to declare to his Excellency Lord Whitworth, that no communication which, both in substance and in form, does not agree with the usages observed among the great powers, and with the most perfect equality between the two states, can any longer be admitted in France; that nothing shall oblige the French government to dispose of countries which do not belong to it, and that it never will acknowledge in England the right of violating, in any manner whatsoever, the treaties made between the two countries.

The undersigned repeats the proposition of giving up Malta to one of the three guaranteeing powers; and as to every other object, unconnected with the Treaty of Amiens, it renews its declaration, that the French government is ready to open a negotiation with respect to them.

You have heard, at your last meeting, the message of government. The contrast between its frank and loyal conduct and that of England must strike all eyes. I saw you manifest your opinion by the noble indications with which you were agitated. You only keep it within bounds, that you might imitate the wise measures and circumspection of government.

If the English government shall give the signal of war, nothing remains for the government of the Republic but to confide in the justice of its cause, and in the God of armies.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs,
(Signed) CH. M. TALLEYRAND.

Message from the First Consul of France to the Legislative Body, relative to War with England, dated St. Cloud, May 20, 1803.

The English Ambassador has been recalled; compelled by this circumstance, the Ambassador of the Republic has quitted a country where he could no longer hear the language of peace.

In this decisive moment Government lays before you, will lay before France, and before all Europe, its first relations with the British Ministry, the negotiations which were terminated by the Treaty of Amiens, and the new discussions which seem to terminate by an absolute rupture. The present age and posterity will there see what it has done to put an end to the calamities of war, with what moderation and with what patience it has laboured to prevent the return of them.

Nothing could break the course of the projects formed for rekindling the flames of discord between the two nations. The Treaty of Amiens was negotiated amidst the clamours of a party that could apply; that there had been no changes in Europe posterior to the Treaty of Amiens, except the organization of the Empire, to which the King of England had assented as Elector of Hanover, which was not, indeed, any more than a necessary consequence of the Treaty of Luneville, long anterior to the Treaty of Amiens.

That the events relative to the political existence of Piedmont, of the kingdom of Etruria, [illegible] of the Italian and Ligurian Republics, were previous to the Treaty of Amiens, and [illegible] in the negotiation of that treaty, France had wished England to acknowledge those three powers; but as they could neither agree upon that point, nor upon the affairs of India, with regard to the destruction of some of the leading powers, and the unexampled acquisitions of the English in that country, it remained to be considered, as they did not constitute a part of the Preliminary Articles, nor of the fundamental object of the pacification of the two States. The undersigned observed, that the French Government neither demanded acknowledgment nor approbation on the part of his Britannic Majesty.

The undersigned added, that, as to the Batavian Republic, it had been acknowledged by the King of England, as he had treated with it; and that, by the treaties existing between that country and France, the rear guard of French troops was to be withdrawn on the entire fulfilment of the Treaty of Amiens.

As to the criminal refugees in London, or in Jersey, where they gave themselves up to all those perverse practices, far from being suppressed, they were pentioned, and well treated by England; and the French Government thought, that, in the present situation of affairs, no importance should be given to that subject.

His Excellency Lord Whitworth proposed a second projet, in which England demanded, that the Civil Government of Malta being left to the Grand Master, the British garrisons should continue to occupy the fortifications of the Island. That proposition was impracticable and tiresome; and, as the first projet, it was contrary to the Treaty of Amiens, and consequently to the basis of the treaty acceded to by the First Consul; it had, besides, the insurmountable inconveniency of placing all the Knights of the Order belonging to the different powers of Europe under the authority and arbitrary government of one; it was, in fact, in itself, an insult to the honour and religion of the Order, bound by every tie to the honour and religion of all Europe.

Thus in all the progress of the negotiation, the Government of the Republic could not but see, that the English Government had only one view and one will—that of not fulfilling the Treaty of Amiens, and to preserve Malta, for the only reason that Malta suited her; and she called that acquisition a *sufficient guarantee*.

But where is the power of Europe, even were it ready to acknowledge its inferiority, which would submit to the will of another, without even a discussion of its rights, and without an appeal to the principles of justice? Where is the power which, placed as

France has been during that discussion, would have submitted to conditions dictated at the commencement of the negotiation, and rather announced by the noise and menace of war, and the preparations for hostilities, than proposed as the means of bringing the two States to a reconciliation.

In a case somewhat similar to the present, a feeble nation, not feeble by want of courage, but by its extent and population, dared to brave the English power in its capital—to expose the habitation of its Kings—endanger its magazines, and the fruits of accumulated industry during 100 years of peace and economy—rather than subscribe to the unjust proposals then made to them, as they are to us to-day, under the idea of the convenience of England, and supported by a forcible argument—Brave men perished—the Danish colonies were invaded, but, however unequal was the contest, honour left that generous nation no choice of the party which it had to embrace.

In the present discussion, policy and honour speaks the same language. If the British Government has the power to conform or not to its own engagements—If it can in the treaties which it has made distinguish between the spirit and the letter—If one admits those mental restrictions as so many authorised restrictions—if the conveniencies of England are the meaning of political conventions—what will not the concessions be that it will not hope to extort successfully from the weakness of France? What will be the measure of the sacrifices and humiliation which she will undertake to impose? To-day the conveniency of England requires a guarantee against France, and she keeps Malta! Formerly the conveniency of England wanted a guarantee against France, and she destroyed Dunkirk, and an English Commissary gave laws in a country, while the colours of France hung waving in the air! To-morrow English conveniency will demand a guarantee against the progress of French industry, and a tarif will be made to stop the progress of commerce, together with our industry.

If we repair our harbours—if we construct a canal—if, by means of encouragement, we re-establish our manufactures—we shall be ordered to destroy our harbours, and demolish our moles, our canals filled up, and our manufactures ruined. They will demand the poverty of France, and that it lays down its arms in order to conform to the conveniencies of England, and afford a *sufficient guarantee* to its Government.

Whether one considers the principles, or examines the consequences, one is equally struck with the injustice and disgrace of these pretensions. It may be asked, if they were submitted to an English Jury, would it hesitate to condemn them unanimously?

The Government of the Republic has a right to be astonished, that the British Ministry could believe itself authorised to impute to it such a degree of abasement. How could they conceive that the actual Government of France would lose in stupid repose both the memory of all that it has done, and the consciousness of all its duties?

Our provinces, are they less extended, less populous? Are we no longer the same men that have sacrificed every thing for the maintenance of our just interests? And if after our success we have shewn the greatest moderation, to what other cause can that moderation be imputed, if not to the justice of our rights and the consciousness of our strength? The undersigned, in making these observations to Lord Whitworth, thinks himself entitled to point out, that the moderate conduct of the whole French Administration, during two whole months of offensive provocations, and in spite of the deep impressions it felt from them, ought to make him appreciate the true character of the French Government. Nevertheless, it is when by its profound silence upon repeated insults, the Government of the French Republic had waited in expectation of having some reparation, or at least differences terminated; when, avoiding to prejudge the final result which affairs might take, it evinced the attention and wish only of considering the means which might be proposed to conciliate and satisfy the British Government; it was then that *verbally*, and without wishing to consent to give any written declaration, his Excellency Lord Whitworth delivered, in the name and by order of his Government, on the 6th Floreal (April 26), to the undersigned the following demands:—

That England shall retain Malta for ten years;

That England shall take possession of the Island of Lampedosa;

That Holland shall be evacuated by the French troops.

His Excellency Lord Whitworth farther declared, that these propositions formed the *ultimatum* of his Court, and that upon refusal to accept them, his Excellency had orders to quit Paris in the course of seven days afterwards.

The undersigned dare say, that there is no example on record of so imperious an *ultimatum*.

What! has war no inconveniencies but

to us! Is the English Minister to judge the French nation so weak, that at a moment when he agitates it by the most important deliberations, he does not think himself bound to conform, on its account, to the usages which are observed by all the Governments of civilized Europe?

Or, indeed, is it not rather that the operation of injustice, which weighs upon the conscience of the public as well as upon that of the private man, has precluded the British Government from signing the demand which it had made; and which, by a course less decisive, it endeavours to reserve to itself in future the means of obliterating the traces of its real claims, and some day to mislead opinion upon the origin of the rupture?

Or, in short, do the Ministers of his Britannic Majesty know so imperfectly the character of the First Consul, as to hope, by means of provocations, to exasperate or to intimidate him, by inducing him either to forget the interests of the nation, or to instigate him to some overt acts, so as that they might afterwards in the eyes of Europe misrepresent the beginning of the war?

The First Consul, more than any man who exists, knows the evils of war, because more than any other man he is accustomed to its calculations and chances. He believes that in such circumstances, when the first sentiments of governments ought to be to calculate upon the catastrophes and the calamities which may be engendered in a new war—he believes that their first duty is not only not to yield to motives of irritation, but to attempt by every way to explain, and to moderate the ungovernable passions of the people.

The undersigned attending at first a moment to the form of that communication of his Excellency Lord Whitworth, begged him to observe, that verbal and fugitive conversations were insufficient for the discussion of such immense interests, of which in ordinary cases all the motives are treated of in the Councils of Nations, after the most mature deliberation. In such Councils, and under such circumstances, nothing is considered as indifferent; forms, expressions even, are weighed, examined, discussed, appreciated, and serve to decide as well as to justify the party that ought to be taken.

If so imprudent and so gross a violation of all forms had originated with the French, what would not have been said, what would not have been written in England? There is not a speaker in either House of Parliament who would not have declared that this departure from the general rules established between nations in important cases was an outrage to the British nation. In the judgment of every body, an offence of this nature would be a motive sufficient for putting an end to the negotiation.

As to the substance of the *ultimatum* proposed, the undersigned has the honour to recal to the recollection of Lord Whitworth, that he was charged to declare to him by a Note delivered the 12th Floreal, that the First Consul was not affected with menaces or with abuse, and that he was content even to pass by forms, which every other Government in similar circumstances would have insisted on.

That the Isle of Lampedosa did not belong to France; that it was under the Sovereignty of another Power; and that power hostile to peace. Scarcely was it concluded, when it became an object of the bitterest censure. It was represented as fatal to England, because it was not disgraceful to France. The seeds of uneasiness were soon sown and dangers were supposed, on which was established the necessity of such a state of peace, that it was a permanent signal for new hostilities. Those base miscreants who had torn the bosom of their country, and who are still destined to tear it, were kept in reserve and in pay. Vain calculations of hatred! The object of it is no longer, France divided by factions and agitated by storms. It is France restored to internal tranquillity, regenerated in her administration and laws, ready to fall with her whole weight on the foreign nation which shall dare to attack her, and to unite with the brigands which atrocious policy might pour into her territories, to organize in it pillage and assassination.

At length an unexpected Message suddenly alarmed England with imaginary armaments in France and in Batavia, and supposed important discussions which divided the two Governments, while no discussion of the kind was known to the French Government.

Formidable preparations for arming were then begun on all the coasts and in the ports of Great-Britain. The sea was covered with ships of war, and it was amidst this preparation that the Cabinet of London required of France to abrogate a fundamental article in the Treaty of Amiens.

They wished, they said, for new guarantees, and they disowned the sacredness of treaties; the execution of which is the first of guarantees that nations can give to each other.

In vain did France invoke that faith which they had sworn to maintain: in vain did she consent to wink at the actual non-execution of the article of the Treaty of

Amiens, which England pretended to pass over; in vain did she defer taking a definitive part until the moment when Spain and Batavia, both contracting parties, should have manifested their will; in vain did she call for the mediation of the powers which had been invited to guarantee, and who, indeed, have guaranteed the stipulation, the abrogation of which was demanded. All her proposals were rejected, and the demands of England became more imperious and more absolute.

It was not consistent with the principles of Government to yield to threats; it was not in its power to make the Majesty of the French people bend under laws prescribed to it with forms so haughty and so novel; had it done so, it would have consecrated to England the right of annulling by its will alone all the stipulations by which it is bound towards France.

It would have authorized it to require from France new guarantees on the least alarm which it might be pleased to suppose, and hence two new principles which would have been placed in the public right of Great-Britain, along with that by which it has disinherited other nations of the common sovereignty of the seas, and subjected to its laws and regulations the independence of their flag.

Government has stopped at that line traced out to it by its principles and its duty. The negotiations have been broken off; we are ready to combat if attacked.

At any rate, we shall combat to maintain the faith of treaties, and for the honour of the French name.

Had we yielded to vain terror, it would have been necessary to combat in order to repel new pretentions; but we should have combated, dishonoured by weakness, degraded in our own eyes, and vilified in the eyes of an enemy, who would have made us at once yield to their unjust pretentions.

The nation will confide in a sensation of its own strength, whatever may be the wounds which the enemy may inflict where we can neither prevent nor reach them. The result of this contest will be such as we have a right to expect from the justice of our cause, and from the courage of our warriors.

The First Consul, BUONAPARTE.

By the First Consul,

The Secretary of State, H. B. MARET.

Note from the Russian Prime Minister relative to the guarantee of Malta, dated, Petersburgh, 12th November, 1802.

The Chancellor of the Empire having received the orders of the Emperor relative to the invitation made to his Imperial Majesty by the two principal contracting parties to the Treaty of Amiens, to accede in quality of guarantee to this Treaty, so far as relates to the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, and their restoration to the possession of the Island of Malta and its dependencies, is authorised to give to the communications of the 22d of October the following reply:

His Majesty the Emperor, from the moment of his accession to the throne, has constantly shewn so strong a desire to seize every opportunity which presented itself of giving to the two principal contracting parties to the Treaty of Amiens the most unequivocal proofs of his sincere desire to do whatever might be agreeable to both of them, and to contribute as far as was in his power to re-establish and to confirm the continuance of the peace existing betwixt them, that it cannot now be supposed that his invariable sentiments on this point can have suffered any change. On the other hand, the two governments are too equitable not to acknowledge that it is beyond the power of the Emperor to yield to the demands made to him in virtue of the 10th article of the Treaty of Amiens, which fixes the future establishment of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, since it is, under every consideration, impossible for his Imperial Majesty to accede as a guarantee to stipulations which are not only contrary to wishes expressed relative to the Order, honoured by the interest he felt in their favour, and the protection he had pledged himself to give them, but which would be inconsistent with what had been agreed upon anterior to that treaty betwixt his Imperial Majesty and one of the two contracting powers, with respect to the said Order, and relative to the independence and neutrality of the Island of Malta.

This consideration, as important in itself, as it is necessarily supported by considerations of a different kind, has obliged the Emperor not to accede to the pressing requests which have been made to him on the point, by the Court of London, in spite of the ardent desire of his Imperial Majesty to comply with the wishes expressed on this subject. The dispositions, which that Court has manifested to accede to the wishes of the Emperor, with respect to the Order and the Island of Malta, and the readiness expressed by the French government to concert measures for promoting the same end, have not failed to be felt with corresponding sentiments of gratitude by his Imperial Majesty. But, the obstacle which opposed his compliance with their wishes, was not weakened, since the public and formal act

continued still contradictory to the known and expressed intention of his Imperial Majesty, and that it was for this act that his guarantee was solicited. Since, however, one of the principal difficulties is removed by the nomination and acknowledgment of the Grand Master, his Majesty the Emperor, desirous of giving to the contracting parties to the Treaty of Amiens the clearest proofs of his friendship, and wishing to omit nothing on his part which can tend to consolidate the general tranquillity of Europe, has determined to propose to the two governments the only plan which, under existing circumstances, can furnish the possibility of waving the demand which they have mutually made, and this plan would be, that the two contracting powers should form a convention or some other act supplementary to the Treaty of Amiens, by which the 10th article of the said treaty relative to the Order and the Island of Malta might be modified, altered, and completed, with respect to several of its dispositions, agreeably to the stipulations of the first arrangement agreed upon by his Imperial Majesty; which by this means being fully and formally re-established, would receive the same sanction as the treaty, of which they would then form an integral part. If the two powers believed that such a supplementary article could be agreed upon, his Majesty the Emperor would hasten to accede to it in quality of guarantee, and to share the obligations attached to such a character, with the courts of Vienna, Madrid, Naples, and Berlin. His Imperial Majesty would do this the more readily, because in complying with the wishes of the two powers, he would only follow the impulse of his own feelings on this subject, from which he is desirous of giving them manifest and reiterated proofs of his good will, by concurring in all possible cases with their wishes.

The Chancellor, by order of the Emperor, that in this affair no delay might be supposed to arise on the part of the court of Russia, hastens to subjoin a projet of the articles which may serve as the basis of a supplementary act alluded to above, in case the two powers should be inclined to accede to it.

The Chancellor of the Empire in communicating these instructions to General Hedouville, Minister Plenipotentiary of the French Republic, which express the intentions of the Emperor, in answer to the note of the 22d of October, has the honour of repeating to him his high consideration.

(Signed) C. ALEXANDER DE WORONTZOW.

St. Petersburgh, November 12, 1802.

(The following Public Papers being imperfect, without the explalanation accompaning them, and which are translated from the Moniteur, the whole is inserted here together.)

Paris, May, 25th, 1803.—The Declaration of the KING of ENGLAND has appeared. It is accompanied by a volume of Papers of 145 folio pages.—This volume contains 72 articles, amongst which ten only are official, and several of those are insignificant. Sixty-two are extracts of letters from ministers to their agents, and from the English agents to their cabinet, letters doubtless fabricated by the Chancellerie, according to the convenience of ministers.—The notes, which are most important, and the most proper to inform the English people of the steps taken by the French government, and of the true spirit of the negotiation, have been carefully suppressed.—And what appears the last degree of shamelessness, and even of folly, is that in the note of Lord Whitworth, dated the 10th of May, printed in page 112 of the Official Papers of London, the most essential passage is omitted, through an unfaithfulness which could not fail to be discovered.

Original Note tranmitted by the English Ambassador to the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Paris, May 10, 1803.

The undersigned Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary from his Britannic Majesty to the French Republic, having transmitted to his Court the proposition made to him by the Minister for Foreign Affairs on the 4th instant, *and that proposition having been judged to be impracticable, by the refusal of his Majesty the Emperor of Russia to listen to it, and as falling, at the same time, below the just pretensions of his Majesty.*

[The remainder of the note is exactly similar to that published in the Correspondence here. The words marked in italics are those which the Moniteur charges the English minister with having omitted.]

This infidelity, committed to cover a false allegation, which they durst not support, has given rise to another. The English ministers have in consequence omitted the note transmitted in answer by Citizen Talleyrand on the 12th of May, which is to the following effect:

Paris, May 12, 1803.

The undersigned is charged to make known to his Excellency Lord Whitworth, Ambassador from his Britannic Majesty, that the First Consul having proposed in the Note of the 4th instant, that the Island of Malta should be delivered into the hands of one of the guaranteeing powers, Russia, Austria, or Prussia, it does not suffice to put an end to that proposition, to argue from the refusal of his Majesty the Emperor of Russia to receive that depôt, since it still remains to be known what are the intentions of their Majesties the Emperor of Germany and King of Prussia.

——That besides the assertion contained in the Note of his Excellency, dated the 10th instant, and which is expressed in these terms—'By the refusal of his Majesty, the Emperor of Russia, to accede, entirely contrary to the guarantee which his Imperial Majesty has formally offered, under the condition of some slight changes which the First Consul had no difficulty in adopting, and which he knows that the English ministry refused, doubtless meditating upon the strange pretensions of keeping Malta.——Moreover, this assertion is in direct contradiction to the assurances which the First Consul has received from Petersburgh, since the Message from his Britannic Majesty was known, and which has been renewed by an authentic communication, which the Count De Marcoff made yesterday of the intentions of his Court.——From whence it results that it is impossible to reconcile the last Note, transmitted by his Excellency Lord Whitworth, with the new confirmation which has been acquired of the disposition of his Majesty, the Emperor of Russia, and he cannot refuse to believe that his Britannic Majesty, better informed, will himself hasten to give to his Excellency different instructions to those which he has received and communicated, in the name of his Government.——The undersigned seizes this occasion of renewing to his Excellency Lord Whitworth, the assurance of his high consideration.

(Signed) C. M. TALLEYRAND.

And the English nation calls itself free, and the parliament represents the nation.—We have translated the whole verbatim, which will be printed in this Journal, for nothing ought to be hidden from the French people.—If they have had the shamelessness to suppress the most important notes, and to garble those of which the originals are in the hands of our government, with respect to objects so important, what confidence can we place in the recital of conversations made by English agents, and turned by the ministry to suit its own purposes?—And thus fifty millions of men are delivered up to be slaughtered.—The giddy spirit which has for two months seized upon the English government will not allow it to reflect; it doubtless thinks that we have neither ink nor arms.—But of what importance to the cabinet of London is the opinion of Europe, or that of posterity? The parliament will make its address, several of the members will be led away by false reports, and this is all that the English ministers desire.—The following decree was communicated on Monday, to the senate, the legislative body, and the tribunate, by the orators of government.

Extract from the Register of the Deliberations of the Government of the Republic. May 22, 1803.

The government of the Republic having heard read, by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, the acts of his Britannic Majesty, dated the 16th of May, and which are to the following effect.

(Then follow the orders of council for an embargo, and for the issuing of Letters of Marque)

Having heard read by the Minister of Marine and Colonies, a dispatch from the Maritime Prefect of Brest, dated this day, announcing that two English frigates having taken two French merchant vessels in the Bay of Audierne, without any previous declaration of war, and in manifest violation of the law of nations, which dispatch is to the following effect:——The day before yesterday two English frigates captured two vessels in the Bay of Audierne; the one was destined for Quimper, to procure timber for building, and the other was laden with salt for Fecamp.

(Signed) "CAFFARELLY,
Maritime Prefect."

DECREES.

Art. I. It is prescribed to all Commanders of Squadrons or Naval Divisions of the Republic, Captains of its Ships and other Vessels of War, to chase those of the King of England, as well as those vessels belonging to his subjects, to attack, capture, and conduct them into the ports of the Republic.

II. Commissions will be delivered, in course, to those French Privateers for which they are demanded, and which, in the event of obtaining those commissions, will be regulated, in conformity with the existing laws and regulations, or with whatever may be made in the mean-time.

III. All the English enrolled in the Militia, from the age of eighteen to sixty, or holding any commission from his Britannic Majesty, who are at present in France, shall be immediately constituted prisoners of war, to answer for those citizens of the Republic who may have been arrested and made prisoners by the vessels or subjects of his Britannic Majesty, previous to any declaration of war.

IV. The Ministers are charged each with what concerns him with the execution of the present decree, which shall be inserted in the Bulletin of Laws.

The First Consul
(Signed) BUONAPARTÉ.
By the First Consul, the Secretary of State
(Signed) H. B. MARET.

The English government has then commenced hostilities by the ruin of one or two miserable traders, who under the faith of treaties were peaceably navigating on our coasts.—It has committed this act of hostility without a declaration of war, without any of the forms used by polished nations and agreed upon amongst them, and in pursuance of those odious principles of public law which it has created for itself alone, and which are entirely barbarous.—It is with pain that the government of the republic sees itself forced to use reprisals, and to constitute prisoners of war all the English enrolled in the militia, and residing in the French territory.—In every thing that is illiberal it will always leave initiation to England, but the French people ought to act towards England as she acts towards France. For too long a period Europe has pursued a different line of conduct. This is what has more particularly authorized England to constitute for herself alone, a public law, to which she is now so much accustomed, that every act of just

reciprocity appears to her an injustice.—A measure was yesterday taken with the English who were in *Paris*, which, it is said, will be adopted generally to all those who are in France.—According to the directions which were given to each of them, at their place of residence, they repaired to the place where the staff was assembled, where their names were taken down, and an order was given to them, to go to-morrow to Gen. Junot, the commandant of the place.—It is thought that the place will then be pointed out to them, to which they are to go and reside, until some determination is come to respecting them, conformably to the conduct which shall be adopted in England. It is said that all the English now in *Paris*, will be sent to *Fountainbleau*.

Proclamation by his Majesty as Elector of Hanover.

GEORGE III. &c.—Whatever the event of the differences now existing between our Crown and the French government may be, we shall, in our capacity as Elector and Member of the German Empire, observe the strictest neutrality, and might therefore justly and confidently expect, that whatever termination the present negotiation may have, our German States and faithful subjects will not be affected by any consequences which may ensue.—Considering, however, the obvious movements of the troops in Holland, the possibility must occur to us, that in case the before-mentioned differences should, against our wishes, not be amicably settled, our German States and subjects may be exposed to a danger, which, if realised, would have the most unfortunate consequences for the whole country in general, and every individual in particular: we, for this reason, hold it to be our most sacred duty to adopt such means, as will, under the blessing of God, prove most efficacious to protect our faithful German subjects, whom Divine Providence has committed to our care. We apply, therefore, to all the loyal subjects of our German States with that confidence to which the love and affection we bear our people, and their uninterrupted loyalty and attachment intitle us to make, in case of such danger, all those efforts and sacrifices to which the duties they owe to us, their loving Sovereign, their attachment to their native country, their family connexions, and every thing dear to them, already bind them. And we do it with the more confidence, as our dearly beloved Son, the Duke of Cambridge, actuated by the tender affection he bears our faithful German States and subjects, is willing to share every danger that may befall them, and personally to assist in every thing that may promote their safety and security. To be prepared for every event that may happen, it is for the present absolutely necessary to know immediately, the exact number of our German subjects, who, if necessity calls, can take up arms for the defence of their country. It is to effect this, that we command all the magistrates of our German States, to lose no time in giving in complete lists of such our German subjects as are fit for military service, excepting those only who serve us, and their country in other capacities: and to make them solemnly promise to come forth when called upon, and give all the assistance in their power for the defence of their country, whenever, and for as long as may be thought necessary.——The known loyalty and patriotism of our beloved subjects, leave us no room to suppose, that any one of them will be so lost, as to transgress so solemn an obligation, or to withdraw himself by a cowardly and treacherous flight from giving his assistance to the defence of his country.—Should, however, against our better expectations such be found, who, in time of danger would desert their country and refuse their aid, such wretches shall, the case being lawfully proved, without hope of pardon, be deprived of all they may possess in our German dominions, and be cut off from all inheritance therein. But we have a better opinion of all our German subjects, and are firmly persuaded, that when necessity calls, they will unanimously and zealously unite to assist, to the utmost of their power in the defence, and for the salvation of their native country.

Hanover, May 16, 1803.

Order for an Embargo, of French and Dutch Vessels, and Vessels bound to Countries occupied by the Armies of France.

At the Court at the Queen's Palace, the 16th day of May 1803, present, the King's Most Excellent Majesty in Council.

It is this day ordered by his Majesty, by and with the advice of his Privy Council, that no ships or vessels, belonging to any of his Majesty's subjects, be permitted to enter and clear out for any of the Ports of the French or Batavian Republics, or for the Ports of any Country occupied by the armies of France, until further order; and his Majesty is further pleased to order, that a General Embargo or Stop be made on all ships, belonging to the French and Batavian Republics whatsoever, now within or which hereafter shall come into any of the Ports, Harbours, or Roads, within the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, together with all persons and effects on board the said ships and vessels; but that the utmost care be taken for the preservation of all and every part of the cargoes on board any of the said ships, so that no damage or embezzlement whatever be sustained; and the Right Honourable the Lords Commissioners of his Majesty's Treasury, the Lords Commissions of the Admiralty, and the Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports are to give the necessary directions herein, as to them may respectively appertain.—*W. Fawkener.*

DOMESTIC.

FROM THE LONDON GAZETTE.

Downing Street, May 9.—His Majesty has been pleased to appoint Major-General David Douglas Wemyss, to be Commander of all his Majesty's Land Forces serving in the Island of Ceylon.

St. James', May 12.—This day Chevalier d'Anduaga, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary from the King of Spain, had his first private Audience of her Majesty.

St. James', May 12.—This day Rufus King, Esq. Minister Plenipotentiary from the United States of America, had his Audience of Leave of her Majesty. [*Note of Editor.*—It is said that Mr. King's place is to be supplied by Mr. Munro, now at Paris, who has always been the mortal enemy of England, and the warm friend of France. We shall attend to his movements here, where we confess, we shall be very sorry to see him.]

Crown-Office, May 13.—Member returned to serve in this present Parliament.—County of Nottingham.—Anthony Hardolph Eyre, of Grove, in the said County, Esq. in the room of the Right Hon. William Cavendish Bentinck, commonly called Lord William Cavendish Bentinck, who hath accepted the Office of Steward or Bailiff of his Majesty's Three Chiltern Hundreds of Stoke, Desborough, and Bonenham, in the County of Buckingham.

Whitehall, May 14.—The King has been pleased to present the Rev. Richard Garveys Grylls, Clerk, Master of Arts, to the Vicarage of Breage, in the County of Cornwall, and Diocese of Exeter, void by the death of the Rev. Edward Marshall.

St. James', May 23.—The King has been pleased to confer the Honour of Knighthood on Sir James Pulteney, Bart. Lieutenant-Colonel Francis Whitworth, Captain Robert Boulton, of the Royal Navy, Rupert George, Esq. and Richard Hankey, Esq. as Proxies to Five of the Knights of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, at the late Installation.

Whitehall, May 24.—The King has been pleased to grant to Edward Bowyer Sparke, Doctor in Divinity, the Place and Dignity of Dean of the Cathedral Church of Bristol, void by the death of Doctor Charles Peter Layard, late Dean thereof.

The King has also been pleased to grant to William Nelson, Clerk, Doctor in Divinity, the Place and Dignity of a Canon or Prebendary of the Metropolitical Church of Canterbury, void by the death of John Lynch, Clerk, Doctor of Laws, late Canon thereof.

Whitehall, May 12.—The King has been graciously pleased to appoint William Radcliffe, of Barnsley, in the County of York, Esq. to the Office of Rouge Croix Pursuivant of Arms, in the Heralds' College, vacant by the promotion of Joseph Hawker, Esq. to the Office of Richmond Herald, in the same College.

Whitehall, May 28.—The King has been pleased to grant to Howel Holland Edwards, Clerk, Master of Arts, the Place and Dignity of a Prebendary of the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster, void by the death of Doctor Robert Poole Finch, late Prebendary thereof.

The King has also been pleased to present the Reverend William Baker, Clerk, Bachelor of Laws, to the Vicarage of Stonehouse, in the County and Diocese of Gloucester, void by the Cession of Thomas Pettat, Clerk, the last Incumbent.

St. James', May 26.—This day Baron Belmont de Melcor, Minister Plenipotentiary from his Serene Highness the Elector of Wirtemberg, had an Audience of her Majesty.

Crown-Office, May 31.—Member returned to serve in this present Parliament.—Borough of Boston.—Thomas Fydell the younger, Esq. in the room of Thomas Fydell, Esq. whose Election for the said Borough has been adjudged to be void.

Monday, May 16.—On the 14th inst. the Lord Mayor received the following letter from Lord Hawkesbury:

"My Lord, I think it right to lose no time in informing your Lordship, that Lisle, the Messenger, has just arrived from Paris, with dispatches from Lord Whitworth, and that his Lordship had received his passports, and was on the point of setting out from Paris on Thursday evening, when the Messenger came away.——I have the honour to be, &c.

(Signed) HAWKESBURY.

This communication the Lord Mayor carried to the Stock Exchange, and published in the usual manner. In the course of the morning various expresses had arrived with intelligence to the above effect, and the funds had fallen upon it. They recovered for some time upon the intelligence in Lord Hawkesbury's note, but they fell again, and left off at 61¼.

On the 15th, the French Ambassador received the Orders of his Court to depart, and accordingly yesterday morning, at 5 o'clock, he set off from his house in Portland Place, with his suite, and proceeded on their route for Dover.

On Thursday evening last, May the 12th, Lord Whitworth departed from Paris, and arrived on Friday night at Breteuil, where he received some communication, which induced his Lordship to send off Sylvester, the Messenger, who arrived in Town at one o'clock yesterday morning. What the nature of the circumstance was that induced his Lordship to take this step has not transpired, but we learn that Ministers on receiving his dispatch, sent back a Messenger with orders to him to come to London with all expedition. Lord Whitworth was prevented from sailing from Boulogne by a contrary wind, he was in consequence to proceed to Calais yesterday, and he was not therefore expected here before this day, the tide not serving to come out of the harbour till night.

Friday, May 20.—Lord Whitworth landed at Dover, at about twelve o'clock yesterday evening, and arrived in town on the night of the 19th. His Lordship was treated on his departure from Calais with every demonstration of respect by the people, as well as by the municipal officers, and the military. He was saluted by a discharge of guns, and all parties seemed to regret the occasion of his departure. On his arrival at Dover, where he found General Andreossi, who had received similar honours, his Lordship sent a message to the French Ambassador, importing a desire to have an interview with his Excellency, before he left this country, and requesting that the latter would point out the mode for the accomplishment of that purpose. General Andreossi returned an answer expressive of high respect and acquiesence, but leaving the arrangement to Lord Whitworth. It was then determined that neither should meet the other at their respective Hotels, and an interview was held at a third place. What passed at this interview, we do not pretend to state. After the meeting, each of the Ambassadors visited the other at their hotels, and both expressed their strong sense of the treatment which they had received in their respective countries, and their anxious hopes that all causes of national differences would soon be removed. General Andreossi then took his leave, with every testimony of public and private respect. He embarked on Wednesday morning at 7 o'clock.

The grand ceremony of the installation of the Knights of the Bath took place on the 19th instant. We have only to remark, that the whole ceremony was conducted with the greatest possible order. The procession commenced about eleven, from the Prince's Chamber to the Abbey. It was near twelve before it had entered Henry VII.'s Chapel. The ceremony of installation took up nearly three hours. The Queen and Princesses had a gallery over the great gate, which they occupied during the ceremony of installation. The Duchess of York came to see the procession return. His Royal Highness the Duke of York, the Grand Master of the Order, was greeted by the

people with the most cordial huzzas. The crowd in every direction was immense.

MR. WINDHAM.

The following account of the celebration of Mr. Windham's Birth Day, at the City of Norwich, will, we trust, give great pleasure to our Readers.

On the 14th of May, more than 140 of the friends of the Right Hon. Wm. Windham, in this City and its neighbourhood, dined at the White Swan, in St. Peter's, in order to celebrate that gentleman's Birth-Day.—The Stewards were, Sir Roger Kerrison, (Mayor of Norwich) Capt. Laton, Capt. John Harvey, and Alderman Browne. After dinner, the following toasts and sentiments were given:

The KING—May limited Monarchy ever be an overmatch for Consular despotism.

The Queen.

The Prince of Wales and Royal Family.

The Duke of York and the Army.

The Duke of Clarence and the Navy.

The Right Honourable Wm. Windham—May the day which gave birth to this accomplished and disinterested Statesman, ever be commemorated by all the truly loyal to the King and Constitution.

[On Mr. Windham's health being given from the Chair, Captain John Harvey pronounced a warm and spirited panegyric on his eminent talents and distinguished public services. He then read a letter which he had received from Mr. Windham, expressing, in terms highly flattering to the stewards and the company present, the sense which he entertained of so public a mark of their esteem.—After this, Mr. Windham's health was drunk with great applause, and a gentleman sung "Rule Britannia," with some additional stanzas, applicable to the occasion; the last of which was encored by the whole company, and Mr. Windham's health was drunk a second time with increased enthusiasm.]

The Mayor of Norwich—Prosperity to the City of Norwich—The Lord Lieutenant, and Prosperity to the County of Norfolk.

Mr. Pitt.

Mr. Alderman Browne in giving Lord Spencer, added—and success to a general Press Warrant—I mean one which would bring to the service of their country, the wisdom, the integrity, and energy, which its present state requires.

Lord Nelson—The Walls of Wood, and the Hearts of Oak, of Old England.

Lord Hutchinson.

Lord Grenville—And to a broad, firm, and able Ministry; with clear, fixed, and decided principles of action.

Sir Sydney Smith.—The Lord Bishop of Norwich.—Mr. Frere.—Colonel Wodehouse.—Colonel Patteson, and the Norwich Volunteers.—General Cowell.—Mrs. Windham.—The Mayor, and Prosperity to the Borough of Yarmouth.

The Country Gentlemen who distinguished and exerted themselves in the cause of Windham and Loyalty.

May the honour of the Nation be supported against the influence of *Consuls* and *Consols*, and this be still our motto, when insulted,

"Britons strike home,
"Revenge your Country's wrongs."

The healths of Lord Nelson, Lord Spencer, and Mr. Pitt, were received with great applause.

General Distribution of the British Army, JUNE 1, 1803.	Cav.	Regiment. Inf.	Militia	Tot Ba.
England and Wales	20	32	76	128
North Britain	1	4	15	20
Ireland	7	23	—	30
Jersey, Guernsey, &c.	—	9	—	9
Gibraltar	—	15	—	15
Egypt and Malta	—	—	—	—
Canada, Nova Scotia, &c.	—	5	—	5
West-Indies	—	22	—	22
Cape of Good Hope, Goree, &c.	—	1	—	1
East-Indies, and on Passage to	5	23	—	28
On Passage to England or Ire.	1	1	—	2
Total	34	135	91	260

BR. NAVY, 1st JUNE.	Line.	50's	Frig.	Sps.	Tot.
In Port and fitting, and with sealed orders	22	5	28	40	95
English and Irish Channels	17	1	21	25	64
Downs and North Sea	3	1	14	21	39
West-Indies and Passage	3	0	4	14	21
Jamaica station	10	0	5	8	23
America and Newfoundland	0	1	6	4	11
Cape of G. Hope, East-Indies,	4	6	8	9	27
Coast of Africa	0	0	1	1	2
Portugal and Gibraltar	0	0	2	2	4
Mediterranean and on Passage	11	2	17	7	37
Hospital and Prison Ships	2	0	2	0	2
Total in Commission	72	16	108	131	327
Receiving Ships	7	0	6	1	14
Serviceable and repairing	9	1	9	6	25
In Ordinary	88	8	78	40	218
Building	24	0	34	9	67
Total	195	25	235	196	651
ORDINARY.					
Portsmouth	30	2	22	14	68
Plymouth	34	1	18	23	76
Chatham	31	6	21	3	61
Sheerness	2	0	7	8	17
River	2	0	25	8	35
Total	99	9	93	56	257

Day of May.	3 per C. Con.	3 pr. C.R.An.	4 pr. C. Con.	5 per Ct. 1797.	Navy 5 per Ct.	Imp. 3 per Ct.	Bank L. Ann.
12	65	63⅛	80½	97⅛	90⅜	61⅞	18
13	64⅛	64	81¼	98⅜	90⅜	62⅛	18
14	61¼	62	79½	97	98	—	18
16	60⅝	59⅝	76⅜	94⅛	95	57⅛	17
20	74⅜	58¼	74⅜	93⅜	94	57	17
21	74½	58⅝	74⅝	93⅛	94⅛	57	15
23	74⅜	58⅝	74⅝	93	94	—	17
24	57½	56⅜	73¼	92⅛	93	—	16
25	57⅜	57	72	91⅜	92⅜	—	18
26	58	56½	78	91⅜	93	—	16
27	57⅛	57⅛	72⅝	92	92⅛	—	15
28	—	59	74⅛	93	94⅛	—	17

Printed by Cox and Baylis, No. 75, Great Queen Street, and published by R. Bagshaw, Bow Street, Covent Garden, where former Numbers may be had; sold also by E. Harding, No. 18, Pall-Mall.